

## WO9005732

Publication Title:

MIXED LIGAND COMPLEXES AND USES THEREOF AS BINDING AGENTS  
AND PROBES TO DNA

Abstract:

Abstract of WO9005732

This invention concerns a coordination complex or salt thereof which is spectroscopically or photoactively determinable when bound to DNA having formula (I), wherein M is a suitable transition metal and each of R<sub>1</sub>, R<sub>2</sub> and R<sub>3</sub> is ethylenediamine, bipyridine, phenanthroline, diazafluorene-9-one or a substituted derivative thereof, or phenanthrenequinonediimine or a substituted derivative thereof, dipyridophenazine or a substituted derivative thereof; wherein R<sub>1</sub>, R<sub>2</sub> and R<sub>3</sub> are bound to M by coordination bonds; provided that at least one of R<sub>1</sub>, R<sub>2</sub> or R<sub>3</sub> is dipyridophenazine or a substituted derivative thereof. The invention also concerns a labelled DNA probe which comprises the complex covalently bound to the DNA probe. Further the invention concerns a method of detecting the presence in a sample of a target DNA of interest which comprises contacting the sample containing the target DNA with a complementary labelled DNA probe under hybridizing conditions and measuring the resulting luminescence emitted from the labelled DNA probe, a change in the luminescence as compared with the luminescence in the absence of the sample indicating the presence of the target DNA.

Data supplied from the esp@cenet database - Worldwide

-----  
Courtesy of <http://v3.espacenet.com>

PCT


WORLD INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ORGANIZATION  
International Bureau



INTERNATIONAL APPLICATION PUBLISHED UNDER THE PATENT COOPERATION TREATY (PCT)

<p>(51) International Patent Classification <sup>5</sup> : C07F 1/08, C08F 3/06, 3/08 C07F 7/24, C08F 13/00, 15/00 C07F 15/02, C08F 15/06</p>	<p>A1</p>	<p>(11) International Publication Number: <b>WO 90/05732</b>  (43) International Publication Date: 31 May 1990 (31.05.90)</p>
<p>(21) International Application Number: PCT/US89/04989 (22) International Filing Date: 7 November 1989 (07.11.89) (30) Priority data: 268,247 7 November 1988 (07.11.88) US (71) Applicant: THE TRUSTEES OF COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY IN THE CITY OF NEW YORK [US/US]; Broadway and West 116th Street, New York, NY 10027 (US). (72) Inventor: BARTON, Jacqueline, K. ; 55 East 87th Street, New York, NY 10128 (US). (74) Agent: WHITE, John, P.; Cooper &amp; Dunham, 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, NY 10112 (US).</p>		<p>(81) Designated States: AT (European patent), AU, BE (European patent), CH (European patent), DE (European patent), DK, FR (European patent), GB (European patent), IT (European patent), JP, LU (European patent), NL (European patent), SE (European patent).  <b>Published</b> <i>With international search report. Before the expiration of the time limit for amending the claims and to be republished in the event of the receipt of amendments.</i></p>

(54) Title: MIXED LIGAND COMPLEXES AND USES THEREOF AS BINDING AGENTS AND PROBES TO DNA



(57) Abstract

This invention concerns a coordination complex or salt thereof which is spectroscopically or photoactively determinable when bound to DNA having formula (I), wherein M is a suitable transition metal and each of R<sub>1</sub>, R<sub>2</sub> and R<sub>3</sub> is ethylenediamine, bipyridine, phenanthroline, diazafluorene-9-one or a substituted derivative thereof, or phenanthrenequinonediimine or a substituted derivative thereof; wherein R<sub>1</sub>, R<sub>2</sub> and R<sub>3</sub> are bound to M by coordination bonds; provided that at least one of R<sub>1</sub>, R<sub>2</sub> or R<sub>3</sub> is dipyridophenazine or a substituted derivative thereof. The invention also concerns a labelled DNA probe which comprises the complex covalently bound to the DNA probe. Further the invention concerns a method of detecting the presence in a sample of a target DNA of interest which comprises contacting the sample containing the target DNA with a complementary labelled DNA probe under hybridizing conditions and measuring the resulting luminescence emitted from the labelled DNA probe, a change in the luminescence as compared with the luminescence in the absence of the sample indicating the presence of the target DNA.

***FOR THE PURPOSES OF INFORMATION ONLY***

Codes used to identify States party to the PCT on the front pages of pamphlets publishing international applications under the PCT.

AT	Austria	ES	Spain	MG	Madagascar
AU	Australia	FI	Finland	ML	Mali
BB	Barbados	FR	France	MR	Mauritania
BE	Belgium	GA	Gabon	MW	Malawi
BF	Burkina Faso	GB	United Kingdom	NL	Netherlands
BG	Bulgaria	HU	Hungary	NO	Norway
BJ	Benin	IT	Italy	RO	Romania
BR	Brazil	JP	Japan	SD	Sudan
CA	Canada	KP	Democratic People's Republic of Korea	SE	Sweden
CF	Central African Republic	KR	Republic of Korea	SN	Senegal
CG	Congo	LI	Liechtenstein	SU	Soviet Union
CH	Switzerland	LK	Sri Lanka	TD	Chad
CM	Cameroon	LU	Luxembourg	TG	Togo
DE	Germany, Federal Republic of	MC	Monaco	US	United States of America
DK	Denmark				

MIXED LIGAND COMPLEXES AND USES THEREOF AS BINDING AGENTS  
AND PROBES TO DNA

The invention was made with government support under grant  
number CG 33309 from the National Institutes of General  
Medical Science, the U.S. Department of Health and Human  
Services and with the support from the National Science  
Foundation.

This application is a continuation-in-part Serial No.  
268,247 filed November 7, 1988 which is a continuation in  
part of U.S. Serial No. 905,295, filed September 8, 1986,  
which in turn is a continuation-in-part of U.S. Serial No.  
693,023, filed January 18, 1985, now U.S. Patent 4,721,669,  
issued January 26, 1988, the contents of which are hereby  
incorporated by reference into the present application.

Background of the Invention

Some of the information set forth herein has been published.  
See Pyle, A.M. and Barton, J.K., Mixed Ligand Complexes and  
Uses Thereof as Binding Agents to DNA, Inorganic Chemistry,  
1987, 26:3820-3823, which was distributed by the published  
on November 6, 1987.

Throughout this application various publications are  
referenced by arabic numerals within parentheses. Full  
citations for these publications may be found at the end of  
the specification immediately preceding the claims. The  
disclosures of these publications in their entireties are  
hereby incorporated by reference into this application in  
order to more fully describe the state of the art to which  
this invention pertains.

There has been considerable interest in elucidating those  
factors which determine affinity and selectivity in binding



of small molecules to DNA. (66-72) A quantitative understanding of such factors which determine recognition of DNA sites would be valuable in the rational design of sequence-specific DNA binding molecules for application in chemotherapy and in the development of tools for biotechnology. Much work has focused on the elucidation of non-covalent interactions with DNA by small natural products and their synthetic derivatives. (67-72) These small molecules are stabilized in binding to DNA through a series of weak interactions, such as the  $\pi$ -stacking interactions associated with intercalation of aromatic heterocyclic groups between the base pairs, and hydrogen bonding and Van der Waals interactions of functionalities bound along the groove of the DNA helix. It would be valuable to understand quantitatively the contributions from these different modes to stabilization of the bound complex at a DNA site.

Previous work has focused on the examination of non-covalent interactions with DNA of transition metal complexes of phenanthroline. (66, 73-77) The cationic complexes has been found both to intercalate into DNA and to bind non-covalently in a surface-bound or groove-bound fashion. These interactions with DNA have been characterized largely through spectroscopic and photophysical studies, and determinations of enantiomeric selectivities associated with binding by the metal complexes have been helpful also in establishing models. (73, 74) On the basis of these investigations, intercalation likely occurs preferentially from the major groove of the DNA helix and is favored for the  $\Delta$  isomer into a right-handed helix. In the case of the surface-bound interaction, it likely occurs along the minor groove of the helix and it is the  $\Lambda$  isomer which is favored in surface-binding to right-handed DNA helices. Figure 5 illustrates models for these binding interactions.

Based upon these binding interactions, derivatives of tris

(phenanthroline) complexes have been developed which recognize selectively different conformations of DNA. By matching shapes and symmetries of the metal complexes to those of DNA conformations, probes for A- and Z-DNA have been designed. (75) Most recently, a diphenylphenanthroline complex of rhodium (III) has been found to induce double-stranded cleavage at cruciform sites upon photoactivation. (76) Although these complexes lack hydrogen bonding donors and acceptors and therefore must be associating with DNA only through a mixture of Van der Waals and intercalative interactions, a high level of specificity is associated with the recognition of different DNA sites by these complexes.

The present invention involves mixed ligand complexes and complexes having three phenanthrenequinone diimine ligands. The mixed ligand complexes of ruthenium (II) were explored for their interactions with B-DNA using a variety of biophysical and spectroscopic methods. Mixed ligand complexes of phenanthroline, phenanthrenequinonediimine, and derivatives thereof have been found to be useful for the construction and characterization of DNA-binding molecules. The ruthenium (II) complexes are particularly useful owing to their intense optical absorption and emission, their relative ease of preparation, and their inertness to substitution and racemization. (77-79)


The technique of DNA footprinting has been used extensively to observe the site-specific binding of proteins, peptides, and drugs to DNA (1-4). Using a variety of chemical and enzymatic footprinting agents, it has been possible to determine the relative binding site sizes and locations for hundreds of DNA-binding proteins. Subtle molecular interactions between DNA and transcription factor, repressor, and other constituents of the transcriptional apparatus are being actively explored using DNA footprinting (5).

Given the power of this methodology, extensive efforts to find new, high resolution footprinting reagents are underway. The most popular and the original footprinting reagent is DNase I, a large nuclease which cleaves with some preference for sequences of intermediate groove widths (6). This level of sequence-neutrality is sufficient for determining the binding sites of large DNA binding proteins. However, small peptides or proteins which bind to sequences insensitive to attack by DNase I can be difficult to visualize. Many chemical footprinting reagents such as  $\text{Cu}(\text{phen})_2^+$  and metalloporphyrins share this inherent problem (7,8). In order to examine DNA binding interactions at higher resolution, many workers have turned to MPE-Fe(II), the first synthetic footprinting reagent and a remarkable tool with respect to its sequence neutrality. An intercalating dye tethered to an  $\text{Fe}(\text{EDTA})^{2-}$  moiety, MPE-Fe(II) has been useful in elucidating the binding sites and sizes of small natural products as well as proteins (9-12). More recently, the clever application to footprinting of  $\text{Fe}(\text{EDTA})^{2-}$  itself, without a tethered DNA-binding moiety, has been made (3,13). Both for  $\text{Fe}(\text{EDTA})^{2-}$  and ME-Fe(II), cleavage results from the diffusion to the DNA helix of hydroxyl radicals, generated in the presence of peroxide and a reducing agent (3,9,13).  $\text{Fe}(\text{EDTA})^{2-}$ , which as an anionic species generates the radicals far from the DNA surface, also shows a high level of sequence neutrality, but since the radical generator does not bind to the DNA, high concentrations of reagents are required. Additionally a drawback with respect to both complexes has been their sensitivity to the presence of various common additives, such as glycerol or  $\text{Mg}^{2+}$ , and their requirements for high concentrations of chemical activators.

Some techniques of photofootprinting have also been developed. An advantage of this method is that the

activation of the DNA cleavage reaction is controlled by light, eliminating the need for adding other chemicals to the protein solution. These techniques include ultraviolet footprinting (14), photofootprinting in the presence of uranyl salts (15), and that in the presence of psoralen or its analogs (16). Ultraviolet light photofootprinting has been applied in vivo as well as in vitro. This technique requires chemical treatment after the photocleavage reaction, however, and the obtained results are sometimes complicated because of differential enhancements due to DNA-protein crosslinking. The second technique, using uranyl salts, shows excellent sequence neutrality but high concentrations of the uranyl salts are required, which may perturb the protein interactions with the DNA or the DNA structure itself. Psoralen footprinting lacks in sequence-neutrality. Owing to these difficulties, despite the inherent advantages of light activation, these photofootprinting reagents have not been widely applied.

Recently, coordinatively saturated phenanthrenequinone diimine complexes of rhodium (III) have been reported to cleave DNA efficiently upon irradiation with long-wavelength ultraviolet light (17). Photocleavage with  $\text{Rh}(\text{phi})_2(\text{bpy})^{3+}$  yields sharp, sequence-neutral cleavage of linear DNA fragments. The addition of free metal ions, chelators, or oxidizing agents is not necessary in this system because the  $\text{Rh}(\text{phi})_2(\text{bpy})^{3+}$  complex is fully assembled and requires activation only by light. The structure of  $\text{Rh}(\text{phi})_2(\text{bpy})^{3+}$  is schematically illustrated below.



Rh(phi)<sub>2</sub>(bpy)<sup>3+</sup> is a high-resolution photofootprinting reagent which successfully maps the precise binding locations and site sizes of distamycin-A and the restriction endonuclease EcoRI. This is the first report of a chemical footprint for EcoRI and the first example of a footprint which reflects the proper site size (18).

Rh(phi)<sub>2</sub>(bpy)<sup>3+</sup> is able to detect both EcoRI bound in the major groove of DNA and the small peptide distamycin, bound in the minor groove. Footprinting with Rh(phi)<sub>2</sub>(bpy)<sup>3+</sup> is not inhibited by moderate concentrations of salts, EDTA, glycerol, or reducing agents, many of which are sometimes necessary to obtain a native interaction of DNA with protein. The complex is easy to handle, being very stable under ordinary conditions are requiring no complicated reaction conditions. Activation with low energy light from a lamp or transilluminator permits excellent experimental control over Rh(phi)<sub>2</sub>(bpy)<sup>3+</sup> footprinting, an absolute requirement for application in vivo.

Extensive data has been accumulated on the luminescence properties of ruthenium (II) polypyridyls, the results of which in sum, suggest that the complexes are extremely useful luminescent labels for DNA. Recently, there has been concern with the use of these complexes as probes for specific sites of binding on the DNA helix. Among the reasons for their use in this work is that each complex can be resolved into stable isomers<sup>(34)</sup> and that their metal-to-ligand-charge-transfer (MLCT) excited states are easily accessible<sup>(35)</sup>. It has previously been found that B-form DNA selectively bound the Δ-enantiomers of Ru(phen)<sub>3</sub><sup>2+</sup> and Ru(dip)<sub>3</sub><sup>2+</sup> over the Λ-forms<sup>(36)</sup>. More recently it was demonstrated that Z-form DNA selectively binds the Λ-enantiomers of Ru(phen)<sub>3</sub><sup>2+</sup> and Ru(dip)<sub>3</sub><sup>2+(81)</sup>. With this in

mind, there is considerable interest in the development of new transition metal probes which would be more general in its binding and provide more information about its local DNA environment. Specifically, a complex whose luminescence properties would respond to subtle changes in environment upon binding.

The present invention involves, one such candidate, because of high binding ability to DNA is  $\text{Ru}(\text{bpy})_2(\text{dppz})^{2+}$  ( $\text{bpy}$  = 2,2'-bipyridine,  $\text{dppz}$  = dipyrido[3,2: a-2',3':cphenazine]<sup>(38)</sup> which does not luminesce in aqueous solution.  $\text{Ru}(\text{bpy})_2(\text{dppz})^{2+}$  was found to have appreciable luminescence in ethanol ( $\lambda_{\text{irr}} = 482 \text{ nm}$ ,  $\lambda_{\text{max}} = 610 \text{ nm}$ ) and in acetonitrile ( $\lambda_{\text{irr}} = 482 \text{ nm}$ ,  $\lambda_{\text{max}} = 615 \text{ nm}$ )<sup>(39)</sup>. The ancillary  $\text{bpy}$  ligands assures that intercalation only occurs via the  $\text{dppz}$  ligand. Furthermore, the two  $\text{bpy}$  ligands are not expected to provide enantiomeric selectivity for this complex<sup>(36)</sup>. In addition the LUMO of this complex is described as having a very large electron density on the phenazine nitrogens<sup>(39)</sup>, because this ligand is believed to extensively intercalate this provides an excellent probe of the helix environment. The major nonradiative deactivation pathway probably involves the protonation of the phenazine nitrogens in the excited state, which potentially provides an excellent probe of the interior of the DNA helix upon intercalation.

Summary of the Invention

This invention concerns a coordination complex or salt thereof which is spectroscopically or photoactively determinable when bound to DNA having the formula

5 
$$\begin{array}{c} R_2 \\ | \\ R_1-M-R_3 \end{array}$$
 wherein M is a suitable transition metal and each of  $R_1$ ,  $R_2$  and  $R_3$  is ethylenediamine, bipyridine, phenanthroline, diazafluorene-9-one, phenanthrenequinonediimine or dipyridophenazine. In the  
10 complex,  $R_1$ ,  $R_2$  and  $R_3$  are bound to M by coordination bonds and  $R_1$  and  $R_2$  may be the same or different, but if the same are different from  $R_3$ . In the preferred embodiments, the invention concerns complexes of ruthenium(Ru) or  
15 rhodium(Rh) wherein  $R_1$  and  $R_2$  are the same.

Also, the invention concerns a coordination complex or salt thereof which is spectroscopically or photoactively determinable when bound to DNA

20 
$$\begin{array}{c} R_2 \\ | \\ R_1-M-R_3 \end{array}$$
 having the formula  $R_1-M-R_3$ , wherein M is a suitable transition metal and each of  $R_1$ ,  $R_2$  and  $R_3$  is ethylenediamine or a substituted derivative thereof, bipyridine or a substituted derivative thereof, phenanthroline or a  
25 substituted derivative thereof, diazafluorene-9-one or a substituted derivative thereof, or phenanthrenequinonediimine or a substituted derivative thereof, dipyridophenazine or a substituted derivative thereof; wherein  $R_1$ ,  $R_2$  and  $R_3$  are bound to M by coordination  
30 bonds; provided that at least one of  $R_1$ ,  $R_2$  or  $R_3$  is dipyridophenazine or a substituted derivative thereof.

The invention also

35 
$$\begin{array}{c} R \\ | \\ R-M-R \end{array}$$
 concerns the complex  $R-M-R$ , wherein M is Ru or Rh and R is

9-10-phenanthrenequinonediimine, 5-nitro-phenanthroline or 3,2-dypyridophenazine or a substituted derivative thereof.

The invention also concerns a method for labeling double stranded DNA with the complex which comprises contacting the DNA with a complex so that it binds to and labels the DNA. In a particular embodiment the complex is used to selectively label a conformation present in the double stranded DNA which comprises contacting the DNA with the complex or an isomer of the complex so that the complex or the isomer binds to the conformation. The invention also also concerns a labeled DNA probe which comprises the complex covalently bound to the DNA probe. The invention further concerns a method of detecting the presence in a sample of a target DNA of interest which comprises contacting the sample containing the target DNA with a complementary labeled DNA probe under hybridizing conditions and measuring the resulting luminescence emitted from the labeled DNA probe a change in the luminescence indicating the presence of the target DNA. The invention also concerns a method for detecting the presence of the conformation present in double stranded DNA which comprises selectively labeling the conformation and then detecting the presence of the complex of the isomer of the complex bound to the conformation. The invention also concerns a method for nicking double stranded DNA by effecting breakage of at least one phosphodiester bond along the DNA which comprises contacting the DNA with the coordination complex under conditions such that the complex binds to the DNA to form an adduct and irradiating the adduct so formed with visible light or ultraviolet radiation of an appropriate wavelength which is absorbed by the complex so as to nick the DNA at the site of binding. Also provided is a method for cleaving double stranded DNA which comprises nicking the DNA according to the present invention and treating the nick DNA with an enzyme which is not deactivated in the presence of



the complex used for nicking DNA and is capable of cleaving single stranded DNA so as to cleave the DNA at the site of the nick. The invention further concerns a method for photocleaving DNA to produce a footprint of DNA binding sites.

5

The invention also provides a method for killing a portion of a population of appropriate tumor cells which comprises contacting the tumor cells under suitable conditions with an effective amount of the coordination complex so as to kill the tumor cells. Lastly, the invention concerns a method for treating a subject afflicted with a human immunodeficiency virus which comprises administering to the subject an effective amount inhibit the activity of the virus.

15

20

25

30

35

Brief Description of Figures

Figure 1:  $\text{Ru}(\text{phi})_3^{2+}$ .

5 Figure 2: Absorption spectra of  $\text{Ru}(\text{phi})_3^{2+}$  in ethanol (-) and from, 500 to 800 nm in HMPA (--). Absorption spectrum of  $\text{Zn}(\text{phi})\text{Cl}_2$  in DMF from 275 to 425 nm (..) is not to scale.

10 Figure 3: Cyclic voltammogram of  $\text{Ru}(\text{phi})_3(\text{PF}_6)_2$  in acetonitrile. All measurements taken at 100 mV/s scan speed, V versus SCE. The featureless oxidative scan between 0 and 0.5 V is not shown.

15 Figure 4: Plot of hydrogen-bonding solvatochromism as measured by the shift in energy of CT bands with donor number (DN); (■)  $\text{Ru}(\text{bpy})_3^{2+}$ ,  $y=22.2-0.004x$ ; (♦)  $\text{Ru}(\text{phi})_3\text{Cl}_2$ , CT3,  $y=19.8-0.004x$ ; (○)  $\text{Ru}(\text{phi})_3\text{Cl}_2$ ; CT1,  $y=15.4-0.02x$ . Measurements were obtained in the following solvent array (DN is parentheses); nitromethane (2.7), dioxane (14.8), propylene carbonate (15.1), water (18.0), THF (20.0), tributyl phosphate (23.7), DMF (26.6), DMSO (29.8), pyridine (33.1), HMPA (38.8).

25 Figure 5: Models for the two non-covalent binding interactions of the octahedral metal complexes with DNA. Shown are  $\Delta\text{-Ru}(\text{phen})_3^{2+}$  (bottom) intercalated into the major groove and  $\Lambda\text{-Ru}(\text{phen})_3^{2+}$  (top) surface-bound against the minor groove of the DNA helix. Figure B displays the same models after a 90° rotation about the helical axis. Graphics were

30

35

performed on an Evans and Sutherland PS390 terminal using the Macromodel program.


5 Figure 6: Illustration of several mixed ligand complexes:  
 $\Lambda$ -Ru(DIP)<sub>2</sub>phen<sup>2+</sup> (top left);  $\Delta$ -Ru(phen)<sub>3</sub><sup>2+</sup> (top right);  $\Delta$ -Ru(phen)<sub>2</sub>phi<sup>2+</sup> (bottom left);  $\Delta$ -Ru(bpy)<sub>2</sub>phen<sup>2+</sup> (bottom right).

10 Figure 7: Ligands used for the synthesis of mixed-ligand ruthenium complexes.

15 Figure 8: Representative Scatchard plots of binding isotherms for mixed-ligand complexes of ruthenium (II) with calf thymus DNA in buffer at 22 C, where r is the ration of bound ruthenium to nucleotide concentrations and C is the concentration of free ruthenium. The solid lines are the best fits to the McGhee and von Hippel equation (45) governing non-cooperative binding to the helix.

20 Figure 9: Visible absorption spectra of Ru(phen)<sub>2</sub>(phi)<sup>2+</sup> (10 $\mu$ M) in the absence (---) and presence (---) of increasing amounts of DNA (0.56 nucleotides/metal per scan).

25 Figure 10: Hypochromism in the visible charge transfer band as a function of [Ru]/[DNA]. A<sub>0</sub>/A represents the ratio of absorbance of free ruthenium (in the absence of DNA) to the absorbance as a function of increasing concentrations of added DNA.  
 30 A = Ru(DIP)<sub>2</sub>(phen)<sup>2+</sup>, B = Ru(phi)<sub>2</sub>(bpy)<sup>2+</sup>,  
 C = Ru(phen)<sub>2</sub>(phi)<sup>2+</sup>, D = Ru(bpy)<sub>2</sub>(phi)<sup>2+</sup>,  
 35 E = Ru(phen)<sub>2</sub>((DIP)<sup>2+</sup>, F = Ru(phen)<sub>3</sub><sup>2+</sup>, G = Ru(5NO<sub>2</sub>-phen)<sub>3</sub><sup>2+</sup>, H = Ru(phen)<sub>2</sub>(flone)<sup>2+</sup>,



5 Figure 11: Unwinding of pBR322 DNA by  $\text{Ru}(\text{bpy})_2(\text{phi})^{2+}$  after incubation with topoisomerase 1 in the presence of increasing concentrations of ruthenium complex as described in the Experimental Section. Lane 1 is DNA contron, Lane 2 is DNA and topoisoemerase alone, Lanes 3-14 are DNA, topoisomerase, and decreasing Ru concentrations from 5.74  $\mu\text{M}$  to 1.57  $\mu\text{M}$ . I and II denote forms I and II DNA.

10

15 Figure 12: Excited state resonace Raman spectrum of  $\text{Ru}(\text{bpy})_2\text{DIP}^{2+}$  in the absence (top) and presence (botom) of calf thymus DNA. The arrows indicated those transitions determined earlier<sup>30</sup> to reflect excited state charge transfer which is localized onto the bypy ligand. These spectral indicate that the presence of DNA the intensity of transitions dominated by charge localization onto bpy is reduced relative to those dominated by charge transfer to the DIP ligand.

20

25 Figure 13. (a).  $\text{Rh}(\text{phi})_2(\text{bpy})^{3+}$  footprinting of distamycin. Lanes A and B: dark and light controls, respectively. Lanes C and D: in the absence of distamycin (C without 90°C treatment after cleavage reaction); E, F, G, H, and I: in the presence of 0.125, 0.25 1.25, 2.5, and 12,5  $\mu\text{M}$  distamycin, respectively, using 5'-end-labeled fragment and 7 min irradiation with a Hg/Xe lamp. Lanes J and K: Maxam-Gilbert A + G and T + C reactions, respectively. Footprinted regions are marked with brackets and numbers.

30

35 (b). Densitometer scans of  $\text{Rh}(\text{phi})_2(\text{bpy})^{3+}$

footprinting in the presence of distamycin (top, data from lane I of Fig 1a) and in the absence of distamycin (bottom, data from lane D of Fig. 1a). Traces of light control and base pair numbers are given in each scan for reference.

(c). Values of  $(I_c - I_d)/I_c$  for footprinting of distamycin are plotted against base pair numbers for both 5'- and 3'- end-labeled strands. Data were taken from Figure 1A. The sequence at the footprinted region is inset.

Figure 14.

(a)  $Rh(\phi)_2(bpy)^{3+}$  footprinting of EcoRI.

Lanes A-D on 5'-end-labeled fragment and E-H on 3'-end-labeled fragment. Lanes C and G:  $Rh(\phi)_2(bpy)^{3+}$  cleavage in the absence of distamycin. D and H: cleavage in the presence of EcoRI (60 units for lane D and 240 units for lane H) after 6 min irradiation with a Hg/Xe lamp. Lanes A and E: Maxam-Gilbert A + G reaction. Lanes B and F: T + C reaction. Footprinted regions are indicated by brackets.

(b). Densitometer scans of  $Rh(\phi)_2(bpy)^{3+}$  footprinting of EcoRI on 5' end-labeled fragment in the presence (top) and absence (bottom) of the endonuclease, together with the light control lane. Base pair numbers are also given.

(c). Values of  $(I_c - I_e)/I_c$  are plotted against base pair number for 5'- and 3'-end labeled strands.

Figure 15

$Rh(\phi)_2(bpy)^{3+}$  footprinting of EcoRI using a transilluminator as light source. Lanes F and G: cleavage by  $Rh(\phi)_2(bpy)^{3+}$  in the absence and presence of EcoRI (296 units),

respectively, using 20-min irradiation with the box. Lane A: Intact 245 pb DNA fragment, 3'-end-labeled. Lanes B and C: dark controls in the absence and presence of EcoRI, respectively. Lanes D and E: light controls in the absence and presence of EcoRI, respectively. Lanes H and I: Maxam-Gilbert A + G and C + T reactions, respectively. Footprinted region is indicated by a bracket.

## 10 Figure 16

15 Autoradiogram of 3'-end-labeled DNA fragment photocleaved in the presence of  $\text{Rh}(\text{phi})_2(\text{bpy})^{3+}$  under various conditions. Lanes A-E are controls: A: Intact DNA fragment (no irradiation and no metal complex). B and C: dark controls (room temperature for 10 and 50 min, respectively, in the dark) in the presence of 5 and 15  $\mu\text{M}$  Rh-complex, respectively. D and E: light controls (no Rh-complex) with 10- and 50-min irradiation, respectively, with focused maximum intensity ( $I_{\text{max}}$ ) of Hg/Xe lamp. Lanes F, G, and H: 15  $\mu\text{M}$  Rh-complex and 1 min, 3 min 20 sec, and 10 min irradiation ( $I_{\text{max}}$ ), respectively. Lanes I, J, and K: 10, 5, and 2.5  $\mu\text{M}$ , rhodium complex, respectively, and 10 min irradiation ( $I_{\text{max}}$ ). Lanes L, M, and N: 1  $\mu\text{M}$  Rh-complex and 10, 25, and 50 min irradiation ( $I_{\text{max}}$ ), respectively. Lane O: 0.5  $\mu\text{M}$  and 10 min irradiation ( $I_{\text{max}}$ ). Lane R: 5  $\mu\text{M}$  rhodium complex and 10, 25, and 50 min irradiation with  $I_{\text{max}}/5$ , respectively, Lane V: 5  $\mu\text{M}$  Rh-complex and 10 min irradiation with  $I_{\text{max}}/10$ . Total DNA concentration was 5  $\mu\text{M}$  base pairs. Lanes P and Q were Maxam-Gilbert A + G and T + C reactions respectively.

Figure 17. Effect of metal ions, EDTA, and glycerol on DNA photocleavage by  $\text{Rh}(\text{phi})_2(\text{bpy})^{3+}$ . Lanes A, B, and C: Intact DNA, dark control, and light control, respectively. Lanes D and E: Maxam-Gilbert A + G and T + C reactions, respectively. Lane F: cleavage by  $\text{Rh}(\text{phi})_2(\text{bpy})^{3+}$  in the absence of additives. Lanes G, H, and I: in the presence of additional 0.1, 0.5, and 2.5 M NaCl, respectively. J, K, and L: in the presence of 1, 10, and 100 mM  $\text{MgCl}_2$ . M, N, and O: in the presence of 1, 10, and 100 mM  $\text{CaCl}_2$ . P, Q, and R: in the presence of 1, 10, and 50 mM EDTA. S, T, and U: in the presence of 0.1, 1, and 10% of glycerol. Fragment was 3'-end-labeled and irradiation time was 5 min with a Hg/Xe lamp under the standard conditions described for  $\text{Rh}(\text{phi})_2(\text{bpy})^{3+}$  photocleavage.

Figure 18 Sequence of the 245 base pair restriction fragment used in these experiments showing in histogram form the footprinted sites both for distamycin (above) and EcoRI (below) using  $\text{Rh}(\text{phi})_2(\text{bpy})^{3+}$ . The 5'-end-labeled fragment is labeled with  $^{32}\text{P}$  at the 3' end of the lower strand.

Figure 19 Comparison of distamycin footprinting by  $\text{Rh}(\text{phi})_2(\text{bpy})^{3+}$  (a), MPE-Fe(II) (b), DNase I (c), and  $\text{Cu}(\text{phen})_2$  (d). Footprinted regions of the  $T_6$  tract are indicated by brackets. 3'-End-labeled fragment, 25  $\mu\text{Mbp}$  total DNA, and 12.5  $\mu\text{M}$  metal complexes (Rh, Fe, and Cu) were used.

(a) Lane A: Light control. Lane B: In the absence of distamycin. Lanes distamycin,

respectively. Irradiation time was 7 min.

(b) Lane A: in the absence of distamycin. Lanes B-H: in the presence of 0.125, 0.25, 0.50, 1.25, 2.5, 5.0, and 12.5  $\mu$ M distamycin, respectively. I: in the absence of MPE. Incubation for DNA cleavage reaction was 5 min at 37 °C.

(c) Lanes A and B: Maxam-Gilbert A + G and T + C reactions, respectively. Lane C: In the absence of distamycin; D, E, and F: in the presence of 1.25, 5.0, and 25  $\mu$ M distamycin, respectively. Incubation was 5 min at 37 °C in the presence of 0.2 units DNase I.

(d) Lanes A and B: Maxam-Gilbert A + G and T + C reactions, respectively. Lane C: In the absence of distamycin. Lanes D, E, and F: in the presence of 1.25, 5.0, and 25  $\mu$ M distamycin, respectively. Incubation was 13 sec at 37 °C.

Figure 20 Comparison of  $\text{Rh}(\text{phi})_2(\text{bpy})^{3+}$  footprinting of EcoRI (a) with other footprinting techniques, MPE-Fe(II) (b) and DNase I (c). Footprinted regions are indicated by brackets. 3'-end-labeled fragment, 5  $\mu$ M bp total DNA, and 5  $\mu$ M metal (Rh or Fe) were employed.

(a) Lane A: Intact DNA fragment. Lanes B and C: Dark control in the absence and presence (200 units) of EcoRI, respectively. Lanes D and E: light control in the absence and presence (200 units) of EcoRI. Lane F: in the absence of IEcoRI. Lanes G-J: in the presence of 50, 100, 200, and 300 units of EcoRI, respectively; Irradiation time was 5 min with a Hg/Xe lamp. Lanes K and L: Maxam-Gilbert A + G and T + C



reactions.

(b) Lane A: in the absence of EcoRI. Lanes B-E: In the presence of 50, 100, 200, and 300 units of EcoRI, respectively. Lanes F and G: DNA controls in the absence of MPE or Fe (II), respectively. Lanes K and L: Maxam-Gilbert A + G and T + C reactions.

Samples were incubated at 37  $\mu$ C for 5 min.

(c) Lanes A and B: DNA in the absence of EcoRI and DNase I, Lane C: In the absence of EcoRI and in the presence of 0.2 units DNase I incubated at 37  $^{\circ}$ C for 2 min. Lanes D and E: In the presence of 64 units EcoRI and in the presence of 0.2 units DNase I incubated at 37 $^{\circ}$ C for 2 and 10 min, respectively. Lanes F, G, and H: In the presence of 252 units EcoRI and in the presence of 0.2, 0.8, and 1.6 units DNase I, respectively, incubated at 37 $^{\circ}$ C for 2, 10, and 10 min, respectively. Lanes I and J: Maxam-Gilbert A + G and T + C, reactions respectively.

Figure 21

Luminescent Enhancement of  $\text{Ru}(\text{bpy})_2(\text{dppz})^{2+}$  with B and Z-form DNA a.  $\text{Ru}(\text{bpy})_2(\text{dppz})^{2+}$  10  $\mu\text{M}$  in buffer R = 50.0 mM NaCl, 5.0 mM Tris-OH, pH = 7.0. b.  $\text{Ru}(\text{bpy})_2(\text{dppz})^{2+}$  10  $\mu\text{M}$  in buffer R, with poly d(GC)·d(GC) 100  $\mu\text{M}$  under conditions providing B-form DNA. c.  $\text{Ru}(\text{bpy})_2(\text{dppz})^{2+}$  10  $\mu\text{M}$  in buffer R-L = 20.0 mM NaCl, 2.0 mM Tris-OH, pH = 7.0,  $\text{Co}(\text{NH}_3)_6^{3+}$  4  $\mu\text{M}$ , with poly d(GC)·d(GC) 100  $\mu\text{M}$  under conditions providing Z-form DNA. All  $\lambda_{\text{ex}} = 482 \text{ nm}$ .

Figure 22

Steady State Polarization of  $\text{Ru}(\text{bpy})_2(\text{dppz})^{2+}$  with B and Z-form DNA Under the conditions that provide B-form (lower curve) DNA the highest

measured polarization is 0.15 with a limiting polarization 0.10. Under the conditions that provide Z-DNA (upper curve) the highest polarization is 0.35 with a limiting polarization of 0.14.  $\text{Ru}(\text{bpy})_2(\text{dppz})^{2+}$  10  $\mu\text{M}$ , poly d(GC) · d(GC) 100  $\mu\text{M}$ ,  $\lambda_{\text{ex}} = 482 \text{ nm}$ .

Figures 23-33 In vitro anti-HIV drug screening results of  $\text{Rh}(\text{DIP})_3$ . The figures plot percent of uneffected untreated control culture against Log of Sample Concentration ( $\mu\text{g/mL}$ ) The --- lines are 0% and 50% Reference lines, ..... lines is Viral Cytopathic Effect, \_\_\_\_\_ line is infected Treated culture ---- line is uneffected treated culture.

### Detail Description of the Invention

This invention concerns a coordination complex or salt thereof which is spectroscopically or photoactively determinable when bound to the DNA having the formula



wherein M is a suitable transition metal and each of  $R_1$ ,  $R_2$  and  $R_3$  is ethylenediamine or a substituted derivative thereof, bipyridine or a substituted derivative thereof, phenanthroline or a substituted derivative thereof, diazafluorene-9-one or a substituted derivative thereof, or phenanthrenequinonediimine or a substituted derivative thereof or dypridophenazine or a substituted derivative thereof; wherein  $R_1$ ,  $R_2$  and  $R_3$  are bound to M by coordination bonds and wherein  $R_1$  and  $R_2$  are the same or different but if the same are different from  $R_3$ . Suitable transition metals include ruthenium(Ru), rhodium(Rh), cobalt(Co), iron(Fe), chromium(Cr), copper(Cu), zinc(Zn), cadmium(Cd), or lead(pb). To date, ruthenium, rhodium and cobalt have proven to be the most effective. Preferred groups for  $R_1$ ,  $R_2$  and  $R_3$  are 2,2'-bipyridine(bpy), 1,10-phenanthroline(phen), 4,5-diazafluorene-9-one(flone), 9,10-phenanthrenequinonediimine(phi), 4,7-diamino-1,10-phenanthroline; 3,8-diamino-1,10-phenanthroline; 4,7-diethylenediamine-1,10-phenanthroline; 3,8-diethylenediamine-1,10-phenanthroline; 4,7-dihydroxyl-1,10-phenanthroline; 3,8-dinitro-1,10-phenanthroline; 4,7-diphenyl-1,10-phenanthroline (DIP); 3,8-diphenyl-1,10-phenanthroline; 4,7-dispermine-1,10-phenanthroline; 3,8-dispermine-1,10-phenanthroline; 5-nitro-phenanthroline (5-NO<sub>2</sub>phen); 3,4,7,8-tetramethyl-phenanthroline (TMP), 4,4'-diphenyl bipyridine; bis 4,4'-methyl bipyridylate and bis 4,4' bipyridylamide, 3,2 dypridophenazine (DPPZ).

In the preferred embodiments of the invention the complex has the formula  $M(\text{phen})_2(\text{phi})$ ,  $M(\text{bpy})_2(\text{phi})$ ,  $M(\text{phi})_2(\text{bpy})$ ,  $M(\text{phi})_2(4,4'\text{-diphenyl bipyridine})$ ,  $M(\text{bis } 4,4'\text{ methyl bipyridylate})_2(\text{phi})$ ,  $M(\text{bis } 4,4'\text{ bipyridylamide})_2(\text{phi})$ ,  $M(\text{bpy})_2(\text{phen})$ ,  $M(\text{phen})_2(\text{bpy})$ ,  $M(\text{phen})_2(\text{flone})$ ,  $M(\text{bpy})_2(\text{DIP})$ ,  $M(\text{phen})_2(\text{DIP})$ ,  $M(\text{ethylenediamine})_2(\text{phi})$ ,  $M(\text{phi})_3$ ,  $M(5\text{-NO}_2\text{phen})_3$  or  $M(\text{DIP})_2(\text{phen})$ ,  $M(\text{bpy})_2(\text{dppz})$ ,  $M(\text{phen})_2(\text{dppz})$ ,  $M(\text{DIP})_2(\text{dppz})$  or  $M(\text{dppz})_2\text{phen}$  wherein M is Ru, Rh or Co.

Especially preferred are the following complexes:  
 $\text{Ru}(\text{bpy})_2(\text{phen})^{2+}$ ,  $\text{Ru}(\text{phen})_2(\text{bpy})^{2+}$ ,  $\text{Ru}(\text{phen})_2(\text{flone})^{2+}$ ,  
 $\text{Ru}(\text{bpy})_2(\text{DIP})^{2+}$ ,  $\text{Ru}(\text{phen})_2(\text{DIP})^{2+}$ ,  $\text{Ru}(\text{DIP})_2(\text{phen})^{2+}$ ,  
 $\text{Ru}(\text{phi})_2(\text{bpy})^{2+}$ ,  $\text{Ru}(\text{phen})_2(\text{phi})^{2+}$ ,  $\text{Ru}(\text{bpy})_2(\text{phi})^{2+}$ ,  
 $\text{Rh}(\text{phi})_2(\text{bpy})^{3+}$ ,  $\text{Rh}(\text{phen})_2(\text{phi})^{3+}$ ,  $\text{Rh}(\text{phi})_2(4,4'\text{-diphenyl bipyridine})^{3+}$ ,  
 $\text{Rh}(\text{bis } 4,4'\text{ methylbipridylate})_2(\text{phi})^{3+}$ ,  $\text{Rh}(\text{bis } 4,4'\text{ bipyridylamide})_2(\text{phi})^{3+}$ ,  
 $\text{Ru}(\text{bpy})_2(\text{dppz})^{2+}$ ,  $\text{Ru}(\text{dip})_2\text{dppz}$ ,  $\text{Ru}(\text{phen})_2\text{dppz}^{2+}$ ,  $\text{Ru}(\text{dppz})(\text{bpy})^{2+}$ ,  $\text{Ru}(\text{dppz})_2(\text{phen})^{2+}$ .

Also, the invention concern a coordination complex or salt thereof which is spectroscopically or photoactively determinable when bound to DNA

$$\begin{array}{c} R_2 \\ | \\ R_1 - M - R_3 \end{array}$$

having the formula  $R_1-M-R_3$ , wherein M is a suitable transition metal and each of  $R_1$ ,  $R_2$  and  $R_3$  is ethylenediamine or a substituted derivative thereof, bipyridine or a substituted derivative thereof, phenanthroline or a substituted derivative thereof, diazafluorene-9-one or a substituted derivative thereof, phenanthrenequinonediimine or a substituted derivative thereof; wherein  $R_1$ ,  $R_2$  and  $R_3$  are bound to M by coordination bonds; provided that at least one of  $R_1$ ,  $R_2$  or  $R_3$  is dipyridophenazine or a substituted derivative thereof.

The invention also

R  
|

concerns the complex R-M-R, wherein M is Ru or Rh and R is 9-10-phenanthrenequinonediimine, 5-nitro-phenanthroline or 3,2-dipyridophenazine or a substituted derivative thereof.

5

Further, the invention concerns the optically resolved delta and lambda isomers of the complex. It has unexpectedly been found that the complex or the delta or lambda isomer of the complex binds and labels DNA. More specifically, the complex or isomer of the complex binds and labels specific conformations of DNA preferentially, i.e. A-DNA, Z-DNA, B-DNA or cruciforms of DNA. The complexes bind to DNA by intercalation or surface binding by means of hydrogen bonding or weak Van der Waals interactions. The method of labeling DNA or specifically labeling a conformation on DNA is effected by contacting the DNA with the complex of the present invention (or an isomer) so that the complex binds to the DNA, preferably at the conformation, thereby labeling the DNA or conformation. The method of labeling may be used to detect the presence of a conformation present in double stranded DNA by selectively labeling the conformation and then detecting the presence of the bound complex or the isomer of the complex. The complex may be detected by spectroscopic methods or photoactive means.

25

The invention also concerns a labeled DNA probe which comprises the complex covalently bound to the DNA probe. The invention also concerns a method of detecting the presence in a sample of a target DNA of interest which comprises contacting the sample containing the target DNA with a complementary labeled DNA probe under hybridizing conditions and measuring the resulting luminescence emitted from the labeled DNA probe a change in the luminescence indicating the presence of the target DNA.

35

By this method, a target DNA sequence is contacted with a complementary labeled DNA probe to bind to the target DNA sequence as is known in the art. The luminescence is measured by conventional methods and a change in luminescence emitted from the labeled DNA probe indicates the labeled DNA probe is bound to the target DNA sequence.

Still another embodiment of this invention is a method for nicking double stranded DNA by effecting single stranded scission, i.e. breakage of at least one phosphodiester bond along the DNA. The method preferable involves contacting the DNA within a cobalt or rhodium containing the DNA with a cobalt or rhodium containing complex of the invention under suitable conditions such that the complex binds to the DNA so as to form an adduct and irradiating the adduct so as to form with visible light or ultraviolet radiation of an appropriate wavelength so as to nick the DNA at the site of binding. An appropriate visible or ultraviolet wavelength in this and other embodiments of the invention is a wavelength which is absorbed by the complex used. As described hereinafter, the ligand band absorption of a complex of this invention may be determined spectroscopically by conventional methods. It is also contemplated that the method for nicking DNA may be preformed in vivo.

The invention further involves a method of cleaving double stranded DNA which comprises nicking the DNA by the above-mentioned method and treating the nicked DNA so produced with a suitable enzyme capable of cleaving single stranded DNA under conditions effective to cleave the nicked, double stranded DNA at the site of the nick. By this method double stranded scission of the DNA is effected. Suitable enzymes for effecting double stranded cleavage of nicked

DNA in this and other embodiments includes those which are not deactivated in the presence of the complex used for DNA nicking, e.g. S1 nuclease. It is further contemplated that this method for cleaving DNA may also be preformed in vivo. The invention also involves a method for selectively  
5 nicking or selectively cleaving DNA at a specific conformation by using the complex or an isomer of the complex such as delta and lambda enantiomer. Appropriate conformations at which the complex may be used to nick or cleave the DNA include Z-DNA, A-DNA, B-DNA or cruciforms of  
10 DNA.

It is also contemplated that the complex may be used for labeling, detecting, nicking, or cleaving other forms of double stranded polynucleotides such as double stranded RNA  
15 and double stranded DNA-RNA hybrids.

Further, it is contemplated a method for footprinting a labeled DNA fragment comprising binding the complex to the labeled DNA fragment and irradiating the complex so as to  
20 cleave the labeled DNA at the site of binding of the complex to the labeled DNA fragment to produce a footprint of the binding site. It is further contemplated that the method for footprinting comprises binding of the complex by intercalation. Also, the binding occurs in major as well as  
25 minor grooves.

Lastly, the invention provides a method of killing a portion of a population of appropriate tumor cells. The method involves contacting the tumor cells under suitable  
30 conditions with an effective amount of the complex or an isomer of the complex to kill the tumor cells. The method may further comprise irradiation the tumor cells with visible light or ultraviolet radiation of an appropriate wavelength at a suitable time after the tumor cells have  
35 been contacted with the complex, thereby permitting the

complex to nick the DNA of the tumor cells. The method may be used for the treatment of a subject afflicted with tumor cells so as to cause regression of the tumor cells. Administration of the complex to the subject may be parenteral, oral, or topical.

5

Lastly, the invention concerns a method for treating a subject afflicted with a human immuno deficiency virus which comprises administering to the subject an amount of Rh (DIP)<sub>3</sub> so as to inhibit the activity of the virus.

10

15

20

25

30

35



Experimental DetailsI. Synthesis and Characterization of  $\text{Ru}(\text{phi})_3^{+2}$  and  $\text{Zn}(\text{phi})^{+2}$ :

5 Ligand Synthesis. 9, 10-Phenanthrenequinone  
bis((trimethylsilyl)-imine) (silylphi) was synthesized from  
9,10-phenanthrenequinone (Aldrich) and sodium  
bis(trimethylsilyl)amide (Fluka) as described by  
10 Tuchtenhagan and Ruhlmann. (55) Important modifications to  
this synthesis include a reaction temperature of no greater  
than  $65^\circ\text{C}$  and a final phenanthrenequinone concentration of  
0.08 M. Under these conditions, orange crystalline  
silylphi was obtained in 37% yield and stored under  
15 nitrogen. The phenanthrenequinone diimine ligand (phi) was  
generated and chelated in situ by combining the silylated  
imine ligand with an ethanolic solution of metal chloride  
by using a modification of Schlosser's method. (56)

20  $[\text{Ru}(\text{phi})_3]\text{Cl}_2$ . A 1.025-g sample of 9, 10-  
phenanthrenequinone bis((trimethylsilyl)imine (2.9 mmol)  
dissolved in 75mL benzene was added to a vigorously  
stirring suspension of  $\text{Ru}(\text{DMSO})_4\text{Cl}_2$  (Alfa Products; 0.355 g,  
0.73 mmol) in 25 mL of EtOH and 75 mL of Benzene. All  
25 solvents were dried and distilled under nitrogen before  
use. This mixture was heated at  $65^\circ\text{C}$  for 1 h until a rich  
purple solution was generated. The reaction vessel was  
then opened to the air. After the crude reaction mixture  
was filtered, it was cooled and evaporated to a small  
30 volume.  $\text{Ru}(\text{phi})_3\text{Cl}_2$  was precipitated with diethyl ether and  
collected on a frit.

35 Solid  $[\text{Ru}(\text{phi})_3]\text{Cl}_2$  was washed with acetone to remove  
several blue byproducts (57) and then diethyl ether to  
remove organic material resulting from in-air decomposition  
of excess ligand. After several diethyl ether

precipitations from ethanol solutions,  $\text{Ru}(\text{phi})_3\text{Cl}_2$  was washed with  $\text{H}_2\text{O}$  to give a final yield of 51%. Samples were often further purified by cellulose column chromatography.

5 The  $^1\text{H}$  NMR spectrum of  $[\text{Ru}(\text{phi})_3]\text{Cl}_2$  is indicative of a symmetrical,  $\text{D}_3$  metal chelate with resonances at 7.6 (2 H, triplet), 8.22 (1 H, doublet), 8.8 (1 H, doublet), and 14.2 ppm (1 H, singlet imine). This is confirmed by elemental analysis. Anal. Calcd for  $\text{Ru}(\text{phi})_3\text{Cl}_2 \cdot \text{H}_2\text{O}$ : C, 62.38; H, 3.99; N, 10.39; Ru, 12.90. Found: C, 62.29; H, 4.21; N, 10.0; Ru, 13.10. Fast atom bombardment (FAB) mass spectroscopy of  $[\text{Ru}(\text{phi})_3]\text{Cl}_2$  showed a strong  $\text{Ru}(\text{phi})_3^{2+}$  molecular ion of Mr 719 with the next largest peak being the  $\text{Ru}(\text{phi})_2^{2+}$  fragment at Mr 514. Infrared spectroscopy revealed characteristic imine N-H stretches at 3274 and 3167  $\text{cm}^{-1}$  and a C=N stretch at 1497  $\text{cm}^{-1}$ .

$\text{Zn}(\text{phi})\text{Cl}_2$ . The zinc complex was synthesized as described for  $[\text{Ru}(\text{phi})_3]\text{Cl}_2$ . Yellow  $\text{Zn}(\text{phi})\text{Cl}_2$  was filtered directly out of the reaction mixture in quantitative yield and washed with diethyl ether,  $\text{H}_2\text{O}$ , and acetone. Anal. Calcd for  $\text{Zn}(\text{phi})\text{Cl}_2 \cdot \frac{1}{3}\text{C}_6\text{H}_6$ : C, 52.15; H, 3.29; N, 7.60; Cl, 19.23. Found: C, 52.14; H, 3.71; N, 7.21; Cl, 18.50. The molecular ion by FAB was the  $\text{Zn}(\text{phi})\text{Cl}^+$  cation of Mr 307 as expected for the proposed structure.

25 The  $^1\text{H}$  of  $\text{Zn}(\text{phi})\text{Cl}_2$  is slightly complicated by the fact that it dissolves only in coordinating solvents such as DMSO or DMF. Upon dissolution, the tetrahedral structure changes to octahedral as two molecules of solvent bind cisoid to the metal center. The resulting species has several isomers and a  $\text{C}_1$  symmetry that renders each proton nonequivalent. Although imine protons are especially affected by the different steric environment of the isomers, there is an integral of two imine protons for each 30 eight aromatic protons. C-H resonances in DMF: 8.52 (1

H, doublet), 8.36 (1 H, doublet), 8.21 (2 H, multiplet), 7.74 (1 H, triplet), 7.55 (2 H, triplet), 7.39 ppm (1 H, mult). N-H resonances: 12.35 (1 H, s), 12.0 ( $1/3$  H, s), 11.8 ( $1/3$  H, s) 11.6 ppm ( $1/3$  H, s).

5 Instrumentation. Ultraviolet-visible absorption experiments were performed by using a Varian-Cary 219 spectrophotometer and  $^1\text{H}$  NMR measurements on a Varian VXR-300 spectrometer. Cyclic voltammetry was condited by using an IBM voltamograph and recorder. Flash photolysis  
10 experiments were made with a YAG laser, monitored with an optical miltichannel analyzer interfaced to a PDP 11/23.

## II. $[\text{Rh}(\text{Phi})_2(\text{bpy})]\text{Cl}_3$ .

15  $[\text{Rh}(\text{Phi})_2(\text{bpy})]\text{Cl}_3$  was synthesized as described previously (17) and MPE was provided by Prof. P.B. Dervan. Distamycin A, alkaline phosphatase, bovine serum albumin, and 2,9-dimethyl-1 10-phenanthroline were obtained from Sigma; lyophilized EcoR I, HindIII, PVuII, terminal  
20 deoxynucleotidyl transferase and T4 polynucleotide kinase from BRL; DNase I from Boehringer Mannheim; dithiothreitol, 3-mercaptopropionic acid, and 1,10-phenanthroline from Aldrich; and  $\alpha$ - $^{32}\text{P}$ -3'-dATP and  $\gamma$ - $^{32}\text{P}$ -dATP from NEN. Tris-acetate buffer for irradiations with  $\text{Rh}(\text{phi})_2(\text{bpy})^{3+}$   
25 contains the following unless specified otherwise: 50mM tris, 20 mM sodium acetate, 18 mM NaCl, pH 7. Loading buffer for electrophoresis on a denaturing polyacrylamide gel contains 80% formamide, 50 mM tris borate buffer (pH 8), 0.1% xylene cyanol, 0.1% bromophenol blue, 0.1 N NaOH,  
30 and 1 mM EDTA. Polyacrylamide Gel-Mix 8 from BRL was used for puring denaturing polyacrylamide gels.

## Preparation of Labeled DNA fragment.

35 Plasmid pJT18-T6 is obtained by inserting an 18 base pair

oligonucleotide (5'-ATATGCAAAAAAGCATAT-3') into the Sma I site of plasmid pUC 18 and amplifying in *E. coli* (JM109) cells by culture. The plasmid was isolated according to literature methods (19). The plasmid thus obtained was first digested with restriction enzyme Hind III and purified by ethanol precipitation. To obtain 3' end-labeled fragment,  $^{32}\text{P}$ - $\alpha$  deoxy-ATP and terminal deoxynucleotidyl transferase were reacted with linearized DNA. This was followed by a second digestion with Pvu II, yielding a 245 bp DNA fragment which was purified on a 5% polyacrylamide gel and isolated by subsequent electrophoretic elution. The DNA fragment was then ethanol precipitated in the presence of sodium acetate and washed with EtOH. After lyophilization, the DNA fragment was dissolved in 1/10 dilution tris-acetate buffer containing 0.1mM EDTA for use or storage at 4°C. To obtain 5' end-labeled fragment, linearized DNA was treated with alkaline phosphatase and labeled with  $^{32}\text{P}$ - $\gamma$ ATP in the presence of polynucleotide kinase. Fragment isolation and purification were performed as described for 3' end-labeled fragment.

#### DNA Cleavage by Rh(phi)2(bpy)3PMA.

A typical procedure for carrying out DNA photocleavage with Rh(phi)2(bpy)3<sup>+</sup> is as follows: 50  $\mu\text{l}$  of a reaction mixture containing  $^{32}\text{P}$ -end labeled DNA fragment (5  $\mu\text{M}$  bp and approx 30,000 cpm, concentration adjusted with calf thymus carrier DNA), and 5  $\mu\text{M}$  [Rh(phi)<sub>2</sub>(bpy)]Cl<sub>3</sub> ( $\epsilon_{350}=23,6000 \text{ M}^{-1}\text{cm}^{-1}$ ) in tris-acetate buffer is added to a 1.7 ml presiliconized polypropylene tube. Open reaction tubes are fixed such that the reaction mixture is directly in the focal point of a 1000 W Hg/Xe lamp beam focused and filtered with a monochromator (Oriel model 77250) and a glass filter to eliminate the light below 300 nm. Samples are irradiated at 310 nm for approximately 5 minutes. After irradiation, 1  $\mu\text{l}$  of -3 $\mu\text{g}/\mu\text{l}$  calf thymus DNA and 25  $\mu\text{l}$  of 7.5 M ammonium

acetate are added to the reaction mixture, which is then heated at 90°C for 5 min and precipitated by addition of 150  $\mu$ l EtOH. The DNA pellet is rinsed with 70% ethanol and then lyophilized. After addition of 2.5  $\mu$ l loading buffer, the

5 samples are electrophoresed on an 8% denaturing polyacrylamide gel.

Rh(phi)<sub>2</sub>(bpy)<sup>3+</sup> Footprinting of Distamycin and EcoRI.

10 Distamycin-A was dissolved in deionized water and the concentration of stock solution was determined optically, using  $\epsilon_{302\text{ nm}} = 3.4 \times 10^4 \text{ M}^{-1}\text{cm}^{-1}$  (20). Final reaction mixtures in trisacetate buffer contained 0.125-25  $\mu$ M distamycin, 25  $\mu$ M bp <sup>32</sup>P-end labeled fragment DNA (nucleotide concentration adjusted with calf thymus DNA carrier) and 12.5  $\mu$ M

15 [Rh(phi)<sub>2</sub>(bpy)]Cl<sub>3</sub>. After addition of distamycin to DNA, the solution was allowed to stand at room temperature for 10 minutes before addition of the rhodium complex. This was followed by another 15 minute room temperature incubation before irradiation as described above. For

20 EcoRI footprinting, EcoRI was dissolved to a final concentration of 40 units/ $\mu$ l in tris-acetate buffer containing 0.1 mM calcium chloride and left at 0 °C for 1 hour (one pmole of the endonuclease corresponds to 769 units, by assuming that the turnover number of the enzyme

25 is 4 per hour per dimer (21). The final reaction mixture in tris-acetate buffer contained 60-360 units of EcoRI, 5  $\mu$ M bp <sup>32</sup>P-end labeled fragment DNA (nucleotide concentration adjusted with pUC18 carrier), 1 mM calcium chloride (necessary to displace traces of Mg<sup>2+</sup> in the enzyme (18)),

30 and 5  $\mu$ M Rh(phi)<sub>2</sub>(bpy)<sup>3+</sup>. DNA and EcoRI were incubated together for 30 minutes, then again for 15 minutes after the addition of Rh(phi)<sub>2</sub>(bpy)<sup>3+</sup>. Following irradiation, the reaction mixture was ethanol precipitated in the presence of -4  $\mu$ g DNA, followed by phenol/chloroform extraction, and

35 another ethanol precipitation.

Rh(phi)<sub>2</sub>(bpy)<sup>3+</sup> Footprinting of EcoRI Using a Transilluminator.

The reaction mixture was prepared as described above. 50  $\mu$ l irradiation volumes are then placed in "short tubes" (capless 1.7 ml presiliconized polypropylene tubes cut down to small cups approximately 7 mm high and 100  $\mu$ l in volume, to minimize the distance between reaction mixtures and the UV-light source), which are placed in a pipette-tip rack and irradiated by inverting a UV transilluminator (Spectroline Model #TR302 for visualizing ethidium-stained agarose gels) on top of them. The UV-filter of the transilluminator may be removed to increase light intensity. Samples should be less than 1 cm from the light source and irradiated for 20 min at room temperature. Work-up is the same as described previously.

Footprinting with other reagents.

Footprinting reactions for distamycin and EcoRI were conducted using DNA binding ligands at comparable concentrations to those employed for the rhodium complex (described above), but using cleavage methodologies for DNase, I, MPE-Fe(II) and Cu(Phen)<sub>2</sub><sup>+</sup> according to the literature (1,2,4,9,22).

25 Electrophoresis, Autoradiography, Densitometry and Data Processing.

DNA pellets from the footprinting reactions were dissolved in 2.5  $\mu$ l loading buffer and electrophoresed on an 8% denaturing polyacrylamide gel as described (19). Reaction products were coelectrophoresed with Maxam-Gilbert sequencing reactions (23). After removal from plates gels were dried and subjected to autoradiography (Kodak, X-OMAT<sup>TM</sup>AR) at room temperature (or -60°C) without an intensifying screen for 2-20 days. Autoradiographs were

scanned on a 2202 Ultra Scan Laser Densitometer (LKB). To obtain the integrated intensity ( $I$ ) of each peak, the integrated area of the light-control or DNA -control (for other footprinters) was subtracted. The resulting  $I_d$  or  $I_e$  (corrected integrated intensity in the presence of distamycin or EcoRI, respectively) was then subtracted from  $I_c$  (the integrated intensity in the absence of distamycin or EcoRI) and reported as a normalized ratio. The final value of  $(I_c - I_d)/I_c$  or  $(I_c - I_e)/I_c$  for given band is then equal to 1 for complete footprinting, 0 for total absence of footprinting and a negative value for enhanced cleavage in the presence of distamycin or EcoRI.

### III. Ligand and Metal Complex Syntheses

Preparations of  $\text{Ru}(\text{bpy})_2(\text{dppz})^{2+}$  ( $10 \mu\text{M}$ ) in buffer  $\text{R}^{(40)}$  and buffer  $\text{R-L}^{(41)}$  ( $\text{pH} = 7.0$ ) produced species that were nonluminescent solutions (figure 21a) ( $\lambda_{\text{irr}} = 482 \text{ nm}$ ). However, when  $\text{Ru}(\text{bpy})_2(\text{dppz})^{2+}$  ( $10 \mu\text{M}$ ) was mixed with  $100 \mu\text{M}$ , poly d(GC)·d(GC) (buffer R-L) the solution was highly luminescent ( $\lambda_{\text{irr}} = 432 \text{ nm}$ ) and produced a  $\lambda_{\text{max}} = 640 \text{ nm}$  (figure 21c) under conditions that are consistent with forming Z-DNA. Luminescent behavior such as this can be attributed to a highly intercalated species. This must be due to the complex being bound to the Z-form and not due to lower salt conditions (or added  $\text{Co}(\text{NH}_3)_6^{3+}$ ) as the under the same Z-form producing conditions, calf thymus DNA produces the expected B-form luminescence. Unlike other intercalating species such as ethidium- $\text{Br}^{(42)}$ ,  $\text{Ru}(\text{bpy})_2(\text{dppz})^{2+}$  does not cause the Z to B transition as solutions of the complex  $\text{Ru}(\text{bpy})_2(\text{dppz})^{2+}$  with Z-form DNA are stable over hours as shown by circular dichroism.

To further test the extent of intercalation of this complex a study of the steady state luminescence polarization of the complex bound to each form of DNA was made. These experiments give information on how rigidly the complex is

held by the DNA. Figure 22, curve A shows the effect of adding 1  $\mu\text{M}$  probe (100  $\mu\text{M}$  DNA) the highest luminescence polarization was observed for this solution (0.15). This reflects a situation where the complex is completely bound to the right-handed helix. As the concentration of  $\text{Ru}(\text{bpy})_2(\text{dppz})^{2+}$  increases, the polarization decreases to limiting value (0.10) at a complex:base pair ratio of 1:10. Further, addition of  $\text{Ru}(\text{bpy})_2(\text{dppz})_2$  produces the same polarization value, we therefore surmise that the helix becomes saturated and the unbound complex does not contribute to the polarization value.

Figure 1 shows the luminescent enhancement with B and Z form DNA. The results show the Z-form has a higher emission of 640 nm compared to 628 nm for the B form.

5-Amino-1,10-phenanthroline. A magnetically stirred solution of 5-amino-1, 10-phenanthroline (2.01 g, 8.93 mmol) and tin(II) chloride dihydrate (6.05 g, 26.81 mmol) was heated to reflux for 3 h in ethanol (100 mL) and then concentrated in vacuo to give a viscous residue. The residue was treated with concentrated NaOH and then extracted with  $\text{CHCl}_3$  (3 x 50 mL). The organic layer was separated, washed with water (2 x 50 mL) and brine (1 x 50 mL), dried over anhydrous sodium sulfate, and then concentrated in vacuo to afford 1.08 g (62%) of the amine as a tan solid: m.p. 255-258° C; MS(fab):m/e 196 (MH+).

1,10-Phenanthroline-5,6-quinone. A magnetically stirred mixture of 5-amino-1,10-phenanthroline (2.88 g, 14.75 mmol) in cold  $\text{H}_2\text{SO}_4$  (ca. 20 mL) was treated with concentrated  $\text{HNO}_3$  (10 mL). The brown colored solution was warmed to 100°C for 2.5 h, cooled to room temperature, and then poured over cracked ice (ca. 150 g). The acidic solution was neutralized with concentrated NaOH and then extracted with  $\text{CHCl}_3$  (3 x 100 mL). The organic phase was washed with water



(4 x 100 mL) and brine (1 x 100 mL), dried over anhydrous sodium sulfate, and then concentrated in vacuo to give about 1.6 g (52%) of the quinone as a rusty orange powder: m.p. 260° C; MS (fab): m/e 212 (MH<sup>+</sup>); uv-vis (ethanol):  $\lambda_{\text{max}}$  236, 242, 291, 316, 357 nm.

5

Dipyridophenazine (DPPZ). A magnetically stirred solution of the quinone (0.10 g, 0.48 mmol) and o-phenylenediamine (0.10 g, 0.92 mmol) was heated to reflux in ethanol (ca 30 mL) for 30 min and then cooled to room temperature. The bright orange solution was concentrated in vacuo, giving an orange solid which was redissolved into CHCl<sub>3</sub> (75 mL). The CHCl<sub>3</sub> solution was washed with aqueous HCl (pH = 5, 3 x 50 mL), water (5 x 50 mL), and brine (1 x 50 mL), and then dried over anhydrous sodium sulfate. The CHCl<sub>3</sub> solution was concentrated in vacuo to give 40.6 mg (30%) of DPPZ as an orange solid: m.p. 247-249; MS (fab): m/e 283 (MH<sup>+</sup>).

15

[Ru(1,10-phenanthroline)<sub>2</sub>DPPZ](Cl<sub>2</sub>)<sub>2</sub>]: A magnetically stirred solution of Ru(4,7-diphenyl-1,1,10-phenanthroline)<sub>2</sub>Cl<sub>2</sub> (60 mg, 0.072 mmol) and DPPZ ligand (21 mg, 0.074 mmol) was warmed to 50-65°C in 90% ethanol/water (ca 75 mL) for about 6 h. The orange solution was cooled, filtered, and then concentrated to dryness in vacuo. The resulting red solid was redissolved into methanol (5 mL) and applied to a short-path (8-10 cm) cellulose chromatography column. The column was eluted first with ethyl acetate and then with 15% methanol/85% ethyl acetate. A red colored fraction was separated and then concentrated in vacuo to give the desired Ru(II) complex as a deep red powder: MS(fab):m/e 1048 (cluster, MH<sup>+</sup>), 766(cluster, loss of DPPZ), 716 (cluster, loss of DIP).

20

25

30

[Ru(DPPZ)<sub>3</sub>](Cl<sub>2</sub>)<sub>2</sub>]: To a magnetically stirred solution of Ru(II)Cl<sub>3</sub>·3H<sub>2</sub>O (0.034 g, 0.13 mmol) in water (10 mL) was added slowly a solution of the DPPZ ligand (0.122 g, 0.43 mmol)

35

in DMF (30 mL). The reaction mixture was warmed to 85-90°C in the dark, giving an olive green mixture. The mixture was treated with  $\text{H}_3\text{PO}_2$  (ca. 2 mL, neutralized with NaOH to pH 6) and then heated to reflux for 2 h. The orange-red solution was filtered, treated with HCl, and then slowly concentrated in vacuo to give the desired complex as a deep red powder: MS(fab): m/e 948 (cluster, as cation), 665 (cluster, loss of DPPZ), 382 (cluster, loss of 2 DPPZ rings); Vis (water):  $\tau_{\text{max}} = 520 \text{ nm}$ .

[Ru(DPPZ) $_2$ Cl $_2$ ]: To a magnetically stirred solution of DPPZ ligand (0.0309 g, 0.110 mmol) in 90% DMF, 10% ethanol and LiCl (0.078 g, 1.1 mmol) 30 mL was added slowly a solution of Ru(Cl) $_3$ ·3H $_2$ O (0.011 g, 0.052 mmol) in ethanol (5 mL). The reaction mixture was warmed to reflux 100-110 °C for 4 hr in the dark, giving a dark purple mixture. The solvent was then removed by reduced pressure to give a dark purple powder. The yield was 75%.

As expected, preparations of Ru(bpy) $_2$ (dppz) $^{2+}$  (10  $\mu\text{M}$ ) in buffer R $^{(9)}$  and buffer R-L $^{(10)}$  (pH = 7.0) produced species that were nonluminescent solutions (figure 21a) ( $\lambda_{\text{irr}} = 482 \text{ nm}$ ). However, when Ru(bpy) $_2$ (dppz) $^{2+}$  (10  $\mu\text{M}$ ) was mixed with 100  $\mu\text{M}$ , poly d(GC) (buffer R) the solution was highly luminescent ( $\lambda_{\text{irr}} = 482 \text{ nm}$ ) produced a  $\lambda_{\text{max}} = 628 \text{ nm}$  (figure 21b) under conditions consistent with B-form DNA. From this data we postulate that the complex has fully intercalated into the helix, and as a consequence the hydrogen bonding of the phenazine nitrogens has been interrupted.

An interesting twist to the luminescent properties of Ru(bpy) $_2$ (bppz) $^{2+}$  is observed when this complex is bound to the left handed helix Z-form DNA. When Ru(bpy) $_2$ (ddpz) $^{2+}$  (10  $\mu\text{M}$ ) was mixed with 100  $\mu\text{M}$ , poly d(GC)·d(GC) (buffer R-L) the solution was highly luminescent ( $\lambda_{\text{irr}} = 482 \text{ nm}$ ) and produced a  $\lambda_{\text{max}} = 640 \text{ nm}$  (figure 21c) under conditions that are

consistent with forming Z-DNA. Luminescent behavior such as this can be attributed to a highly intercalated species. This must be due to the complex being bound to the Z-form and not due to lower salt conditions (or added  $\text{Co}(\text{NH}_3)_6^{3+}$ ) as the under the same Z-form producing conditions, calf thymus DNA produces the expected B-form luminescence. Unlike other intercalating species such as ethidium- $\text{Br}^{11}$ ,  $\text{Ru}(\text{bpy})_2(\text{dppz})^{2+}$  does not cause the Z to B transition as solutions of the complex  $\text{Ru}(\text{bpy})_2(\text{dppz})^{2+}$  with Z-form DNA are stable over hours as shown by circular dichroism.

To further test the extent of intercalation of this complex we studied the steady state luminescence polarization of the complex bound to each form of DNA. These experiments give information on how rigidly the complex is held by the DNA. Figure 22, curve A shows at 1  $\mu\text{M}$  probe (100  $\mu\text{M}$  DNA) the highest luminescence polarization was observed for this solution (0.15). This reflects a situation where the complex is completely bound to the right-handed helix. As the concentration of  $\text{Ru}(\text{bpy})_2(\text{dppz})^{2+}$  increases, the polarization decreases to a limiting value (0.10) at a complex: base pair ratio of 1:10. Further, addition of  $\text{Ru}(\text{bpy})_2(\text{dppz})^{2+}$  produces the same polarization value, we therefore surmise that the helix becomes saturated and the unbound complex does not contribute to the polarization value.

Similarly, when 1  $\mu\text{M}$   $\text{Ru}(\text{bpy})_2(\text{dppz})^{2+}$  is titrated into poly d(GC)·d(GC) (100  $\mu\text{M}$ ) in the Z-form, luminescence polarization is also observed, but in this case the value is 0.35, over double the value found with the analogous solution with B-form. This suggests that the complex,  $\text{Ru}(\text{bpy})_2(\text{dppz})^{2+}$  binds better to the Z-form and is held more rigidly to this left-handed helix. As more complex is added the observed polarization reduces to a limiting value of 0.14, still higher than the analogous sample with B-

form, thus further confirming the Z-form is a more rigid structure than the B-form. Lastly, these results suggest that  $\text{Ru}(\text{bpy})_2(\text{dppz})^{2+}$  binds to Z-form with a ratio of 1 metal complex : 10 base pairs.

5

10

15

20

25

30

35

As described above the structure of the DNA helix is important in suquesting  $H_2O$  from the molecular switch,  $Ru(bpy)_2(dppz)^{2+}$ . A study of the effect of destroying the helical structure of the DNA after the complex has bound or, in other words, follow the luminescence as the DNA melts was negative. For comparison a study of the temperature dependence of the luminscence in isopropanol. At 25°C the lifetime of the complex was 209 ns. As the temperature of the solution was increased there was an accompanying decrease in the life of 102 ns (Table 1). This decrease in lifetime was linear with a slope of 2.1 nsdeg and an intercept of 267 ns. This linear behavior is expected and is similarly observed in other systems<sup>(33)</sup>. Furthermore the apparent quantum yield for luminescence does not change appreciably over this temperature range.

While a linear relationship of the luminescence is observed for  $Ru(bpy)_2(dppz)^{2+}$  in iso-propanol as a function of temperature this is not the behavior seen when the complex is bound to DNA. When the complex,  $Ru(bpy)_2(dppz)^{2+}$  is bound to cal-thymus (CT) DNA (100  $\mu M$ ) under low salt conditions at 25 °C a biexponential lifetime is observed. A short component which is assigned to a surface interaction, and a long component which is assigned to an intercalated species. As is shown in Table 1, the short component remains relatively unchanged until 70 °C when there is an abrupt decrease in the lifetime to 45 ns at 85 °C. The behavior of the long component also shows this behavior although not as abruptly. Under these conditions the CT DNA melts and the observed lifetimes of the complexes are similar to those lifetimes measured with single stranded DNA. It is also noted that the quantum yield for luminescence decreases as the temperature is increased, this being due to less of the complex bound at the higher temperatures. In fact there is an abrupt

decrease in the quantum yield at the melting temperature at this salt concentration. This decrease in quantum yield may be explained thus: when the complex is bound to the double stranded form the quenching ability of  $H_2O$  is inhibited while at the melting temperature the single stranded form of DNA cannot protect the complex from quenching of  $H_2O$  and therefore the observed luminescence is not as intense.

10

15

20

25

30

35

Table 1

The Luminescent Lifetimes of  $\text{Ru}(\text{bpy})_2(\text{dppz})^{2+}$  (\*) in Various Solvents and in the presence of DNA Solvent

5	Solvent	Temp in °C	$\tau$ (ns)
	w/o DNA		
	H <sub>2</sub> O	25	---
	Buffer	25	---
	CH <sub>3</sub> OH	25	30
10	Iso-propanol	25	210
	Iso-propanol	35	192
	Iso-propanol	45	174
	Iso-propanol	55	154
	Iso-propanol	65	129
	Iso-propanol	75	102
		W/ CT DNA	
15	$\mu\text{M}(\text{short})\text{long}^{**}$	100	
	Buffer	25	(75)259
	Buffer	35	(73)232
	Buffer	45	(73)232
	Buffer	55	(68)204
20	Buffer	65	(68)189
	Buffer	75	(54)144
	Buffer	85	(45)118

\* 10  $\mu\text{M}$   $\text{Ru}(\text{bpy})_2(\text{dppz})^{2+}$

\*\* Two components of the lifetime are observed, the short component is assigned to a surface bound species, while the long component is assigned to an intercalated species.

25

30

35

#### IV. Anti-HIV Drug Testing

The procedure used For testing agents active against (HIV) is designed to detect agents acting at any stage of the virus reproductive cycle. The assay basically involves the killing of T4 lymphocytes by HIV. Small amounts of HIV are added to cells, and at least two complete cycles of virus reproduction are necessary to obtain the required cell killing. Agents which interact with virions, cells, or protect cells from cytolysis. The system is automated in several ceatures to accomodate large numbers of candidate agents, and is generally designed to detect anti-HIV activity. However, compounds which degererate or are rapidly metabolized in the culture conditions may not show activity in this screen. Also, while every attempt has been made to reduce variability, precise values for  $EC_{50}$ ,  $IC_{50}$ , and Therapeautic Index are not possible. All tests are compared with a positive (AZT-treated) control done at the same time under identical conditions.

##### The Procedure:

1. R4 lymphocytes (CEM cell line) are exposed to HIV at a virus to cell ratio approximately 0.05, and plated along with noninfected control cells in 96-well microtiter plates.
2. Candidate agent is dissolved in dimethyl sulfoxide (unless otherwise instructed), then diluted 1:200 in cell culture medium. Further dilutions (half- $\log_{10}$ ) are prepared before adding to an equal volume of medium containing either infected or noninfected cells.
3. Cultures are incubated at 37° in a 5% carbon



dioxide atmosphere for 6 or 7 days.

4. The tetrazolium salt, XTT, is added to all wells, and cultures are incubated to allow formazan color development by viable cells.

5

5. Individual wells are analyzed spectrophotometrically to quantitate formazan production, and in addition are viewed microscopically for detection of viable cells and confirmation of protective activity.

10

6. Drug-treated virus-infected cells are compared with drug-treated noninfected cells and with other appropriate controls (untreated infected and untreated noninfected cells, drug-containing wells without cells, etc.) on the same plate.

15

7. Data are reviewed in comparison with other tests done at the same time, and a determination about activity is made.

20

Several complexes were tested for use as agents active against (HIV). Results of the complex Rh(DIP)<sub>3</sub> are presented in tables 2-12 and Figures 23-33. The results indicate the Rh(Dip)<sub>3</sub> complex is moderately active in inhibiting the activity of HIV.

25

30

35

Table 2

Index	Summary		Infected Culture		Uninfected Culture	
	Concentration	Dose( $\mu\text{g}/\text{mL}$ )	Response(%)	Dose ( $\mu\text{g}/\text{mL}$ )	Response(%)	
IC 50 ( $\mu\text{g}/\text{mL}$ )	3.86 x 10 <sup>+</sup>	1.25 x 10 <sup>-</sup>	2.8	1.25 x 10 <sup>-</sup>	110.1	
EC50 ( $\mu\text{g}/\text{mL}$ )	7.67 x 10 <sup>+</sup>	1.25 x 10 <sup>-</sup>	2.6	1.25 x 10 <sup>-</sup>	113.1	
T150 (IC/EC)	5.03 x 10 <sup>+</sup>	1.25 x 10 <sup>-</sup>	-2	1.25 x 10 <sup>-</sup>	106.0	
		1.25 x 10 <sup>-</sup>	-7	1.25 x 10 <sup>-</sup>	103.2	
		1.25 x 10 <sup>-</sup>	-3	1.25 x 10 <sup>-</sup>	111.0	
		1.25 x 10 <sup>+</sup>	1.1	1.25 x 10 <sup>+</sup>	106.5	
		1.25 x 10 <sup>+</sup>	63.2	1.25 x 10 <sup>+</sup>	98.6	
		1.25 x 10 <sup>+</sup>	-3	1.25 x 10 <sup>+</sup>	-6	

Table 3

Index	Summary	Infected Culture		Uninfected Culture		Response(X)
		Concentration	Dose( $\mu\text{g}/\text{mL}$ )	Dose( $\mu\text{g}/\text{mL}$ )	Response(%)	
IC 50 ( $\mu\text{g}/\text{mL}$ )		4.40 x 10 <sup>+</sup>	1.25 x 10 <sup>-</sup>	1.25 x 10 <sup>-</sup>	100.3	
EC50 ( $\mu\text{g}/\text{mL}$ )			1.25 x 10 <sup>-</sup>	1.25 x 10 <sup>-</sup>	98.9	
T150 (IC/EC)			1.25 x 10 <sup>-</sup>	1.25 x 10 <sup>-</sup>	89.3	
			1.25 x 10 <sup>-</sup>	1.25 x 10 <sup>-</sup>	91.0	
			1.25 x 10 <sup>-</sup>	1.25 x 10 <sup>-</sup>	93.4	
			1.25 x 10 <sup>+</sup>	1.25 x 10 <sup>+</sup>	99.5	
			1.25 x 10 <sup>+</sup>	1.25 x 10 <sup>+</sup>	112.3	
			1.25 x 10 <sup>+</sup>	1.25 x 10 <sup>+</sup>	-1.6	
					4.6	
					1.9	
					-5.0	
					-5.8	
					-6.6	
					-4	
					12.7	
					.1	

35			
30			
25			
20			
15			
10			
5			

Table 4

Summary		Infected Culture		Uninfected Culture	
Index	Concentration	Dose(µg/mL)	Response(%)	Dose (µg/mL)	Response(%)
IC 50 (µg/ML) EC50 (µg/mL) T150 (IC/EC)	4.06 x 10 <sup>+</sup>	1.25 x 10 <sup>-</sup>	21.7	1.25 x 10 <sup>-</sup>	133.6
	4.36 x 10 <sup>+</sup>	1.25 x 10 <sup>-</sup>	26.1	1.25 x 10 <sup>-</sup>	131.0
	9.33 x 10 <sup>+</sup>	1.25 x 10 <sup>-</sup>	5.2	1.25 x 10 <sup>-</sup>	108.6
		1.25 x 10 <sup>-</sup>	5.5	1.25 x 10 <sup>-</sup>	108.9
		1.25 x 10 <sup>-</sup>	4.9	1.25 x 10 <sup>-</sup>	107.0
		1.25 x 10 <sup>+</sup>	15.4	1.25 x 10 <sup>+</sup>	116.1
		1.25 x 10 <sup>+</sup>	79.2	1.25 x 10 <sup>+</sup>	109.7
		1.25 x 10 <sup>+</sup>	-5.1	1.25 x 10 <sup>+</sup>	-6.8

Table 5

Index	Summary	Infected Culture		Uninfected Culture		
		Concentration	Dose( $\mu\text{g/mL}$ )	Response(%)	Dose ( $\mu\text{g/mL}$ )	Response(%)
IC 50 ( $\mu\text{g/mL}$ )	2.74 x 10 <sup>-</sup>		1.25 x 10 <sup>-</sup>	11.5	1.25 x 10 <sup>-</sup>	105.1
EC50 ( $\mu\text{g/mL}$ )			1.25 x 10 <sup>-</sup>	11.6	1.25 x 10 <sup>-</sup>	82.1
I150 (IC/EC)			1.25 x 10 <sup>-</sup>	.1	1.25 x 10 <sup>-</sup>	65.1
			1.25 x 10 <sup>-</sup>	.3	1.25 x 10 <sup>-</sup>	53.1
			1.25 x 10 <sup>-</sup>	1.3	1.25 x 10 <sup>-</sup>	44.1
			1.25 x 10 <sup>+</sup>	2.4	1.25 x 10 <sup>+</sup>	41.0
			1.25 x 10 <sup>+</sup>	27.2	1.25 x 10 <sup>+</sup>	32.4
			1.25 x 10 <sup>+</sup>	-8	1.25 x 10 <sup>+</sup>	-2.1

Index	Concentration	Infected Culture		Uninfected Culture	
		Dose( $\mu$ g/mL)	Response(%)	Dose ( $\mu$ g/mL)	Response(%)
IC 50 ( $\mu$ g/mL) EC50 ( $\mu$ g/mL) T150 (IC/EC)	5.91 x 10 <sup>-4</sup>	1.17 x 10 <sup>-4</sup>	6.5	1.17 x 10 <sup>-4</sup>	101.9
		1.17 x 10 <sup>-4</sup>	5.6	1.17 x 10 <sup>-4</sup>	94.1
		1.17 x 10 <sup>-4</sup>	6.3	1.17 x 10 <sup>-4</sup>	96.8
		1.17 x 10 <sup>-4</sup>	5.3	1.17 x 10 <sup>-4</sup>	95.5
		1.17 x 10 <sup>-4</sup>	6.6	1.17 x 10 <sup>-4</sup>	97.9
		1.17 x 10 <sup>-4</sup>	9.8	1.17 x 10 <sup>-4</sup>	101.2
		1.17 x 10 <sup>-4</sup>	14.7	1.17 x 10 <sup>-4</sup>	28.1
	1.17 x 10 <sup>-4</sup>	-4	1.17 x 10 <sup>-4</sup>	-8	

Table 7					
Index	Summary		Infected Culture		Uninfected Culture
	Concentration	Dose( $\mu\text{g/mL}$ )	Response(%)	Dose ( $\mu\text{g/mL}$ )	
IC 50 ( $\mu\text{g/mL}$ )	5.41 x 10+	1.17 x 10-	9.1	1.17 x 10-	1.17 x 10-
EC50 ( $\mu\text{g/mL}$ )	2.15 x 10+	1.17 x 10-	9.4	1.17 x 10-	1.17 x 10-
T150 (IC/EC)	2.51 x 10+	1.17 x 10-	9.7	1.17 x 10-	1.17 x 10-
		1.17 x 10-	9.1	1.17 x 10-	1.17 x 10-
		1.17 x 10-	7.4	1.17 x 10-	1.17 x 10+
		1.17 x 10+	14.0	1.17 x 10+	1.17 x 10+
		1.17 x 10+	151.9	1.17 x 10+	1.17 x 10+
		1.17 x 10+	-6	1.17 x 10+	1.17 x 10+

Index	Summary	Infected Culture		Uninfected Culture	
		Pose( $\mu\text{g/mL}$ )	Response(%)	Pose ( $\mu\text{g/mL}$ )	Response(%)
1C 50 ( $\mu\text{g/mL}$ )	3.28 x 10 <sup>+</sup>	1.17 x 10 <sup>-</sup>	7.5	1.17 x 10 <sup>-</sup>	96.6
EC50 ( $\mu\text{g/mL}$ )	3.01 x 10 <sup>+</sup>	1.17 x 10 <sup>-</sup>	8.4	1.17 x 10 <sup>-</sup>	97.4
T150 (1C/EC)	1.09 x 10 <sup>+</sup>	1.17 x 10 <sup>-</sup>	8.0	1.17 x 10 <sup>-</sup>	101.8
		1.17 x 10 <sup>-</sup>	11.1	1.17 x 10 <sup>-</sup>	98.1
		1.17 x 10 <sup>-</sup>	7.9	1.17 x 10 <sup>-</sup>	101.3
		1.17 x 10 <sup>+</sup>	13.4	1.17 x 10 <sup>+</sup>	99.1
		1.17 x 10 <sup>+</sup>	103.3	1.17 x 10 <sup>+</sup>	91.8
		1.17 x 10 <sup>+</sup>	-2.8	1.17 x 10 <sup>+</sup>	-2.1

Table 8



50

5

10

15

20

25

30

35

Table 9

<u>Index</u>	<u>Summary</u>	<u>Infected Culture</u>		<u>Uninfected Culture</u>		
		<u>Concentration</u>	<u>Dose(<math>\mu\text{g/mL}</math>)</u>	<u>Response(%)</u>	<u>Dose (<math>\mu\text{g/mL}</math>)</u>	<u>Response(%)</u>
IC 50 ( $\mu\text{g/mL}$ )	2.55 x 10 <sup>+</sup>		1.17 x 10 <sup>-</sup>	1.5	1.17 x 10 <sup>-</sup>	96.5
EC50 ( $\mu\text{g/mL}$ )			1.17 x 10 <sup>-</sup>	1.7	1.17 x 10 <sup>-</sup>	80.8
T150 (IC/EC)			1.17 x 10 <sup>-</sup>	1.1	1.17 x 10 <sup>-</sup>	86.9
			1.17 x 10 <sup>-</sup>	1.6	1.17 x 10 <sup>-</sup>	90.3
			1.17 x 10 <sup>-</sup>	1.0	1.17 x 10 <sup>-</sup>	88.4
			1.17 x 10 <sup>+</sup>	1.2	1.17 x 10 <sup>+</sup>	69.7
			1.17 x 10 <sup>+</sup>	43.8	1.17 x 10 <sup>+</sup>	11.0
			1.17 x 10 <sup>+</sup>	-1.1	1.17 x 10 <sup>+</sup>	-1

Table 10

Index	Summary		Infected Culture		Uninfected Culture	
		Concentration	Dose ( $\mu\text{g/mL}$ )	Response (%)	Dose ( $\mu\text{g/mL}$ )	Response (%)
1C 50 ( $\mu\text{g/mL}$ )		$4.21 \times 10^+$	$1.17 \times 10^-$	6.7	$1.17 \times 10^-$	100.2
EC50 ( $\mu\text{g/mL}$ )		$2.48 \times 10^+$	$1.17 \times 10^-$	9.1	$1.17 \times 10^-$	102.4
T150 (1C/EC)		$1.69 \times 10^+$	$1.17 \times 10^-$	8.0	$1.17 \times 10^-$	115.3
			$1.17 \times 10^-$	8.2	$1.17 \times 10^-$	121.1
			$1.17 \times 10^-$	11.0	$1.17 \times 10^-$	113.8
			$1.17 \times 10^+$	18.1	$1.17 \times 10^+$	128.4
			$1.17 \times 10^+$	116.5	$1.17 \times 10^+$	113.2
			$1.17 \times 10^+$	-0.8	$1.17 \times 10^+$	-1.1

Table 11

Index	Summary	Infected Culture		Uninfected Culture	
		Dose( $\mu\text{g/mL}$ )	Response(%)	Dose ( $\mu\text{g/mL}$ )	Response(%)
IC 50 ( $\mu\text{g/mL}$ ) EC50 ( $\mu\text{g/mL}$ ) T150 (IC/EC)	2.64 x 10 <sup>+</sup>	1.17 x 10 <sup>-</sup>	.6	1.17 x 10 <sup>-</sup>	101.1
		1.17 x 10 <sup>-</sup>	.8	1.17 x 10 <sup>-</sup>	95.3
		1.17 x 10 <sup>-</sup>	.2	1.17 x 10 <sup>-</sup>	110.6
		1.17 x 10 <sup>-</sup>	.1	1.17 x 10 <sup>-</sup>	108.9
		1.17 x 10 <sup>-</sup>	.5	1.17 x 10 <sup>-</sup>	93.7
		1.17 x 10 <sup>+</sup>	1.3	1.17 x 10 <sup>+</sup>	73.3
		1.17 x 10 <sup>+</sup>	8.4	1.17 x 10 <sup>+</sup>	7.0
		1.17 x 10 <sup>+</sup>	-7	1.17 x 10 <sup>+</sup>	-1.0

Index	Summary	Infected Culture		Uninfected Culture	
		Dose( $\mu\text{g/mL}$ )	Response(X)	Dose ( $\mu\text{g/mL}$ )	Response(X)
IC 50 ( $\mu\text{g/mL}$ ) EC50 ( $\mu\text{g/mL}$ ) T150 (IC/EC)	Concentration	9.14 x 10 <sup>-</sup>	12.4	9.14 x 10 <sup>-</sup>	92.9
		1.82 x 10 <sup>+</sup>	18.5	1.82 x 10 <sup>+</sup>	91.8
		3.65 x 10 <sup>+</sup>	64.7	3.65 x 10 <sup>+</sup>	82.4
		7.31 x 10 <sup>+</sup>	45.6	7.31 x 10 <sup>+</sup>	55.2
		1.46 x 10 <sup>+</sup>	-3	1.46 x 10 <sup>+</sup>	-9
		2.92 x 10 <sup>+</sup>	-9	2.92 x 10 <sup>+</sup>	-1.6
		5.85 x 10 <sup>+</sup>	-1.8	5.85 x 10 <sup>+</sup>	-7
		1.17 x 10 <sup>+</sup>	-1.8	1.17 x 10 <sup>+</sup>	-1.5

Table 12

The Graphic Results Summary Section: Figures 23-33 display a plot of Log 10 of the sample's concentration (as  $\mu\text{g/mL}$  or molar) against the measured test values expressed as a percentage of uninfected, untreated control values. The solid line connecting the diamond symbols depicts the percentage of surviving HIV-infected cells treated with your sample (at the indicated concentration) relative to uninfected, untreated controls. This line expressed the in-vitro anti-HIV activity of your sample. The dashed line connecting the square symbols depicts the percentage of surviving uninfected cells treated with your sample relative to the same uninfected, untreated controls. This line expresses the in-vitro growth inhibitory properties of your sample. The viral cytopathic effect in this particular experiment is indicated by a dotted reference line. This line shows the extent of destruction of cells by the virus in the absence of treatment and is used as a quality control parameter. Values of this parameter less than 50% are considered acceptable in the current protocol. Reference lines at 0% and 50% are depicted as alternating dots and dashes.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

I. Synthesis and Characterization. The complex  $\text{Ru}(\text{phi})_3^{2+}$  can be synthesized from the silylated phi ligand in greater than 51% yield. Alternate synthetic schemes, involving  
5 metal reaction and concomitant oxidation of coordinated diaminophenanthrene, were less reproducible and gave poor yield.  $[\text{Ru}(\text{phi})_3]\text{Cl}_2$  is a stable molecule that does not decompose upon exposure to air or by continuous irradiation with visible light. The ligand is not similarly stable but  
10 instead rapidly condenses to the dimeric phenanthromimidazole. Hence spectral comparisons between coordinated ruthenium complexes and free ligand cannot be easily accomplished. The zinc complex was therefore synthesized to provide a spectroscopic analogue for the  
15 coordinated ligand. Despite reflux with high ligand concentrations, only the mono-phi zinc adduct formed.

$\text{Ru}(\text{phi})_3\text{Cl}_2$  is a vivid purple molecule with a rich absorption spectrum. A representation of its structure is shown in  
20 Figure 1. The electronic spectrum of  $\text{Ru}(\text{phi})_3^{2+}$ , along with that of  $\text{Zn}(\text{phi})\text{Cl}_2$ , is given in Figure 2. The ruthenium complex shows three intense transitions in the visible region, at 510 nm ( $\epsilon_{\text{max}}=18\,200\text{ M}^{-1}\text{ cm}^{-1}$ ). Assignment of the transitions is aided by comparison to the spectrum of  
25  $\text{Zn}(\text{phi})\text{Cl}_2$ , which, by virtue of its  $d^{10}$  electron configuration, exhibits only  $\pi-\pi^*$  transitions and should approximate the electronic behavior of the air-sensitive phenanthrenequinone diimine ligand. As can be seen in Figure 2, the zinc complex shares with the ruthenium species  
30 transitions at 380 nm ( $\epsilon_{\text{Zn}}=2000\text{ M}^{-1}\text{ cm}^{-1}$ ,  $\epsilon_{\text{Ru}}=4000\text{ M}^{-1}\text{ cm}^{-1}$ ), 300 nm ( $\epsilon_{\text{Zn}}=4500\text{ M}^{-1}\text{ cm}^{-1}$ ,  $\epsilon_{\text{Ru}}=22\,500\text{ M}^{-1}\text{ cm}^{-1}$ ), and 256 nm ( $\epsilon_{\text{Zn}}=50000\text{ M}^{-1}\text{ cm}^{-1}$ ,  $\epsilon_{\text{Ru}}=45000\text{ M}^{-1}\text{ cm}^{-1}$ ). These higher energy  $[\text{Ru}(\text{phi})_3]\text{Cl}_2$  transitions may therefore be assigned  $\pi-\pi^*$  on the basis of their similarity to those of  $\text{Zn}(\text{phi})\text{Cl}_2$ . The  
35 broad intense transitions for the ruthenium complex at

longer wavelengths (510, 640, and 660 nm) may be assigned in contrast as charge-transfer transitions.

5       Cyclic voltammetry reveals multiple electrochemical reduction steps and oxidations in the ruthenium complex (Figure 3). Electrochemical oxidation of  $[\text{Ru}(\text{phi})_3](\text{PF}_6)_2$  in acetonitrile is irreversible. Oxidation potentials of 1.23 and 1.42 eV versus SCE were observed at a scan speed of 100 mV/s. Of the six reduction potentials observed at -0.38, -0.60, -0.75, -0.95, -1.11, and -1.28 eV, only those at -0.60, -1.11 and -1.28 eV were found to be reversible. A standard of  $[\text{Ru}(\text{phi})_3](\text{PF}_6)_2$  showed first redox potentials of -1.31 and +1.30 V, respectively. As may be expected, the increased  $\pi$ -acidity of the phi ligand compared to that of bipyridyl or phenanthroline leads to substantially decreased reduction potentials for the  $\text{Ru}(\text{phi})_3^{+2}$  complex.

20       Possible emission from  $[\text{Ru}(\text{phi})_3]\text{Cl}_2$  was monitored at pH 1-11, in various solvents and at 77 K. No emission was observed from 350 to 800 nm. The lack of emission is understandable in view of the short lifetime of the excited state and the transient excited-state absorption spectrum ( $\lambda_{\text{max}} = 440 \text{ nm}$ ), measured by flash photolysis, revealed a lifetime of  $\leq 6 \text{ ns}$ , the length of the laser pulse.

25       The excited-state energy of  $\text{Ru}(\text{phi})_3^{+2}$  appears to be highly dependent on the molecular environment. Small changes in pH, salt concentration, or solvent lead to large variations in the  $\lambda_{\text{max}}$  of the charge-transfer (CT) bands. As can be seen in Figure 4, this solvent dependence contrasts sharply the little solvatochromism observed for  $\text{Ru}(\text{bpy})_3^{2+}$  (59). Most significantly, the energy of the 660-nm charge-transfer band (CT1 in ethanol) decreases linearly as the Lewis base character, or donor number (DN), (60) of the solvent increases. CT1 commonly found among ruthenium diimine complexes. Curiously, it is only the CT1 absorption and not

30

35

its companion band at 640 nm (CT2) that displays hydrogen-bonding solvatochromism with Lewis bases. The two seemingly fused bands at low DN seem to move apart in energy as the DN increases, and the CT1 band red shifts to as much as 700 nm in HMPA. The energy of the 510-nm band (CT3) fluctuates with solvent, but like the MLCT bands of  $\text{Ru}(\text{bpy})_3^{2+}$ , this fluctuation is not linear with DN. Thus the CT2 and CT3 transitions of  $\text{Ru}(\text{phi})_3^{2+}$  are not sensitive to hydrogen bonding and must be of distinctly different character than the lowest energy CT1 band, which fluctuates between 650 and 700 nm as the strength of hydrogen-bonding interactions increases. Such solvatochromic behavior lends itself well to the application of the complex as a photophysical probe, because the energy of bands like CT1 becomes a sensitive indicator of the metal environment and possible hydrogen bonding interactions.

The spectral characteristics of  $\text{Ru}(\text{phi})_3^{2+}$  reveal several novel and unexpected features of the electronic structure of the complex. Perhaps most interesting is the lowest energy charge-transfer transition, CT1, centered at 660 nm in ethanolic solution. This transition is among the lowest energy transitions thus far observed for monomeric ruthenium (II) species. (61) Blue ruthenium species have been reported previously, (58) but while their structures have remained elusive, all have been formulated as multinuclear species. The low-energy transitions in  $\text{Ru}(\text{phi})_3^{2+}$  may arise in part from the coordination of the highly delocalized phi ligand. Coordinated phenazines and dicyanomethylene-substituted phenanthrolines represent other applications of an extended  $\pi$ -framework, yet for those the charge-transfer transitions are centered at wavelengths more than 100 nm shorter. (62)

Most curious however is the comparison to the mixed-ligand complex (51)  $\text{Ru}(\text{bpy})_2\text{phi}^{2+}$ . The mixed species shows charge-



transfer transitions at 450 and 525 nm, which may be attributed to localized charge transfer onto the bpy and phi ligands, respectively, in the excited state. Spectra of mixed-ligand polypyridyl complexes of ruthenium (II) have in general been the simple sum of spectra for the tris-chelate complexes, since the metal to ligand charge-transfer is localized in these systems. (63) Also surprising is the short excited-state lifetime of  $\text{Ru}(\text{phi})_3^{2+}$  and the solvent dependence of one of the low-energy transitions.

The distinctive spectral characteristics of  $\text{Ru}(\text{phi})_3^{2+}$  might be understandable on the basis of a delocalized charge transfer onto the three ligands. The sequential lowering of the energy of the transition (150 nm change in wavelength) (64) with increasing substitution of phi ligands suggests such delocalization and stands in sharp contrast to spectral characteristics of the localized bipyridyl system, when the intensity rises but the energy of the charge-transfer band does not shift appreciably with increasing bpy substitution. This delocalization may also explain the intense low-energy transitions observed in other tris(-diimine) complexes. (52, 65) The delocalized framework may, finally, also account for the short excited-state lifetime of the complex, owing to large spin-orbit coupling that would be inherent in a completely delocalized system. Alternatively, the excited state is sufficiently low in energy that it may be rapidly deactivated by coupling to the ground state.

In summary,  $\text{Ru}(\text{phi})_3^{2+}$  displays intense, unusual transitions at low energies. On the basis of a comparison with a zinc analogue, the transitions may be described as charge transfer in character. By comparison with a mixed-ligand complexes of phi, a delocalized charge-transfer transition is suggested. Finally the dependence of the transitions on hydrogen bonding in addition to the rich intensity at long

wavelengths renders the complex useful as a biophysical probe.

#### Synthesis and Characterization of Mixed Ligands Complexes:

5 A subset of the complexes examined is shown schematically in Figure 6. The complexes examined are coordinatively saturated and rigid in structure. All are dications and therefore the electrostatic component of the binding is a constant across the series (to first approximation given  
10 some size variation). By varying ligands and ligand substituents in the complexes in a systematic fashion, as illustrated in series, the contributions of the different ligand functionalities and sizes to the binding interactions with DNA can be determined. The ligands employed in this  
15 study are shown in Figure 7. The study of the mixed ligand complexes with DNA offers the opportunity to explore systematically how such factors as molecular shape and hydrogen bonding stabilize small molecules on DNA.

20 Materials:  $\text{RuCl}_3 \cdot 3\text{H}_2\text{O}$  was purchased from Engelhard Co. Ligands (Aldrich) were checked for purity by NMR and recrystallized if necessary.

$\text{Ru}(\text{bpy})_2(\text{phen})\text{Cl}_2$ ,  $[\text{Ru}(\text{phen})_2(\text{bpy})]\text{Cl}_2$ : These complexes were  
25 synthesized by methods as described previously. (59)  
 $\text{Ru}((\text{phen})_2(\text{DIP}))\text{Cl}_2$ :  $\text{Ru}(\text{phen})_2\text{Cl}_2$  (1 mmole) was added to 1 equivalent of 4, 7-diphenyl-1, 10-phenanthroline (DIP) and fluxed in 14 ml 75% ethanol/water for 30 minutes. The product was isolated as the  $\text{ClO}_4^-$  salt for chromatography on  
30 cellulose (10%  $\text{CHCl}_3$ /hexane) and converted to the chloride salt by ion exchange. NMR(DMSO): 8.79 (4dd), 8.4 (4s), 8.24 (2d), 8.22 (2s), 8.16(2d), 8.08 (2d), 7.83 (2dd), 7.78 (2dd), 7.75(2d), 7.63(10m); FABMS ion mass: 794  
[ $\text{Ru}(\text{phen})_2(\text{DIP})\text{Cl}_2\text{ClO}_4\text{H}_2\text{O}$ ] $^{2+}$ , 614 [ $\text{Ru}(\text{phen})_2(\text{DIP})\text{Cl}_2$ ] $^{2+}$ .

[Ru(bpy)<sub>2</sub>(DIP)]Cl<sub>2</sub>: Synthesized as described above, using Ru(bpy)<sub>2</sub>Cl<sub>2</sub> rather than Ru(phen)<sub>2</sub>Cl<sub>2</sub> as starting material.

[Ru(DIP)<sub>2</sub>(phen)]Cl<sub>2</sub>: Ru(DIP)<sub>2</sub>Cl<sub>2</sub> was refluxed in ethanol with one equivalent of phenanthroline. The product was  
5 purified by cellulose chromatography. The Ru(DIP)<sub>2</sub>Cl<sub>2</sub> starting material, like the other bis(polypyridyl) complexes, was readily prepared by dissolving 3 mmoles RuCl<sub>3</sub>·3H<sub>2</sub>O, 30 mmoles LiCl and 6 mmoles DIP ligand in 100 ml DMF and refluxing for four hours. The reaction mixture was  
10 stripped of solvent and the product precipitated from ethanol/water. Further purification was as for [Ru(phen)<sub>2</sub>(DIP)]Cl<sub>2</sub>.:NMR(DMSO): 8.82(2d) 8.42(2s), 8.34(2d), 8.25(4s), 8.23(2d), 8.18(2d), 7.87(2dd), 7.80(2d), 7.74(2d), 7.69 (20m); FABMS ion mass: 946 [Ru(DIP)<sub>2</sub>(phen)]<sup>2+</sup>, 766  
15 [Ru(DIP)<sub>2</sub>]<sup>2+</sup>, 614 [Ru(DIP)(phen)]<sup>2+</sup>.

[Ru(5-nitrophenanthroline)<sub>3</sub>]]Cl<sub>2</sub>: Synthesized as described by Lin et al. (81)

[Ru(phen)<sub>2</sub>(4,5-diazafluorene-9-one)]Cl<sub>2</sub>: One equivalent of  
20 4,5-diazafluorene-9-one and a suspension of one mmole Ru(phen)<sub>2</sub>Cl<sub>2</sub> in 30 ml were refluxed in wet ethanol for four hours and recrystallized from acetone/heptane. The 4,5-diazafluorene-9-one ligand was synthesized as described by  
25 henderson et al. (30) NMR (CD<sub>3</sub>CN): 8.71 ppm (2 dd), 8.61 (2.dd), 7.88 (2m), 7.59(4m), 7.39(2m); FABMS ion mass: 644 [Ru(phen)<sub>2</sub>(flone)]<sup>2+</sup>.

[Ru(bpy)<sub>2</sub>(phi)]Cl<sub>2</sub>: This complex was prepared as previously  
30 reported by Belser et al. (78). NMR (DMSO): 13.67 ppm (2,s N-H), 8.68 (4d), 8.60 (2d), 8.35(2d), 8.05(2t), 8.0 (2t), 7.75 (2d), 7.57(2t), 7.43(8m); FABMS ion mass: 620 [Ru(bpy)<sub>2</sub>(phi)]<sup>2+</sup>, 465 [Ru(bpy)(phi)]<sup>2+</sup>, 414 [Ru(bpy)<sub>2</sub>]<sup>2+</sup>. Anal. Calcd for [Ru(bpy)<sub>2</sub>(phi)](PF<sub>6</sub>)<sub>2</sub>: C:44.90; H: 2.90; N:  
35 9.20; found C: 44.62; H: 3.02; H: 8.9. A crystal structure

(data not shown), determined by x-ray diffraction analysis, confirms the coordination geometry of this species.

[Ru(phen)<sub>2</sub>(phi)]Cl<sub>2</sub>: As with the synthesis of Ru(bpy)<sub>2</sub>(phi)Cl<sub>2</sub>, this compound was prepared by refluxing  
5 0.19 mmoles Ru(phen)<sub>2</sub>Cl<sub>2</sub>, 1.2ml 0.1M NaOH and 0.7 mmoles diaminophenanthrene in 5 ml H<sub>2</sub>O containing a catalytic amount of zinc dust. After one hour, 3 ml EtOH was added and the resultant purple solution was air oxidized for 16 hours in the presence of 0.5 ml NH<sub>4</sub>OH. The final red  
10 solution was extracted with diethyl ether to remove organic impurities and precipitated with KCl. NMR (DMSO): 13.81 ppm (2s, N-H), 8.86(2d), 8.75(2d), 8.63 (2d), 8.55(4m), 8.37 (4s), 8.05(1d), 7.95(1d), 7.85 (1d), 7.80 (2d), 7.78(1d), 7.73(2t), 7.57(2t); FABMS ion mass: 667 [Ru(phen)<sub>2</sub>(phi)]<sup>2+</sup>,  
15 460 [Ru(phen)<sub>2</sub>]<sup>2+</sup>, 282 [Ru(phen)]<sup>2+</sup>. Anal. Calcd for Ru(phen)<sub>2</sub>(phi)Cl<sub>2</sub>.KCl. 5H<sub>2</sub>O: C:50.50; H:4.02; N:9.30; Found: C:50.11; H:4.04; N:9.84.

[Ru(phi)<sub>2</sub>(bpy)]Cl<sub>2</sub>: obtained by a synthesis identical to  
20 that for [Ru(benzoquinonediimine)<sub>2</sub>(bpy)]Cl<sub>2</sub>. (78) 9,10-diaminophenanthrene was used as the ligand substrate instead of diaminobenzene. In addition, solvent for the final air oxidation step of this compound was 50% ethanol/water rather than pure water. Like the other phi-containing compounds,  
25 this complex was first isolated as the PF<sub>6</sub>-salt and converted to chloride by precipitation with KCl or ion exchange on AG MP-1 resin from Bio-Rad. NMR (DMSO): 14, 16 ppm (2s N-H), 12.87 (2s N-H), 8.78 (4t), 8.6(2d), 8.52(4d), 8.20(4m), 7.75(4t), 7.65(6m); FABMS ion mass: 669  
30 [Ru(phi)<sub>2</sub>(bpy)]<sup>2+</sup>, 514[Ru(phi)<sub>2</sub>]<sup>2+</sup>, 464 [Ru(phi)(bpy)]<sup>2+</sup>, 307 [Ru(phi)]<sup>2+</sup>. Anal. Calcd. for Ru(phi)<sub>2</sub>(bpy)Cl<sub>2</sub>.6H<sub>2</sub>O: C:53.78; H: 4.76; N:9.90. Found: C:53.84; H: 4.96; N:9.02.

#### METHODS

Instrumentation: NMR spectra were recorded on a Varian VXR-300MHz spectrometer. FABS were performed using a VG Analytical 7070EQ Mas Spectrometer (78), and elemental analyses were done by Galbraith Laboratories in Nashville, Tennessee. UV-Visible absorbance spectra were recorded on a Varian CARY-219 absorbance spectrophotometer. Extinction coefficients for the compounds were determined versus ruthenium concentrations obtained by atomic absorption spectroscopy with known ruthenium standards. [Ru(bpy)<sub>3</sub>]Cl<sub>2</sub> solutions were also employed for these determinations as an internal standard. A Varian AA-875 atomic absorption spectrophotometer was used for these determinations.

Emission spectra were measured on a Perkin-Elmer LS-5 fluorescence spectrometer. The samples were excited at their corresponding isosbestic points. All the measurements were made at 20°C in a thermostatted cuvette holder with 3 nm entrance slit and 10 nm exit slit. Ruthenium solutions employed were 7 µM in concentration and calf thymus DNA was added to a ratio of 40:1 nucleotide/metal; ruthenium-DNA solutions were allowed to incubate for 15 minutes before enhanced spectra were recorded. The emission enhancement factors were measured by comparing the intensities at the emission spectral maxima in the absence and presence of DNA, under similar conditions.

The luminescence lifetime measurements were done on a PRA SPC (single photon counting) spectrometer with some minor modifications. The samples were excited with a nitrogen filled thyratron gated flash lamp and the data were collected using a Tracor Northern 1710 multichannel analyser. The data were then transferred to a PDP-11/03 computer and deconvoluted with PRA software. The validity of the convergent biexponential concentrated solution of DNA (5mM DNA-phosphate) in buffer was added to a solution of the metal complex (4 µM) in buffer and allowed to equilibrate.

Lifetimes of the samples were measured 0.5 hr after the metal complexes were mixed with DNA. All measurements were made at 20°C and under air saturated conditions.

5 Excited state resonance Raman spectra were run on a home-built Raman spectrometer with an intensified multichannel detector. (84) The samples were excited by a QuantaRay, Q-switched, Nd-YAG laser (DCR-2, FWHM +6ns, 5mj per pulse at 355 nm). The laser power was high enough to saturate the  
10 excited state population and also to scatter off from the excited state formed during the laser pulse-width. The sample solution was pumped through a nozzle to form a smooth thin jet which was intercepted by the laser. The back scattered light was collected at a small angle to the pump beam and focused onto the entrance slit of the Spex triple-  
15 mate spectrograph. The third stage of the spectrograph contained at 2400 grooves/mm grating to provide 2 cm<sup>-1</sup> resolution for the Raman experiments. The entire experiment was run by a home made menu-driven program with customized graphics written in Heminway Basic. The spectra were  
20 calibrated using the known spectrum of Ru(bpy)<sub>3</sub><sup>2+</sup>\*. (85) To a solution of calf thymus DNA (1mM) was added Ru(bpy)<sub>2</sub>DIP<sup>2+</sup> (40 μM) and the solution was left to equilibrate for 0.5 hour. The solution was then circulated as a thin, smooth and slow stream. No degradation in the sample, as  
25 determined by optical absorption, was observed after recording of the Raman spectrum under these conditions.

Measurement of Solubilities: Solubilities of the compounds were measured by preparing saturated solutions of metal  
30 complex in buffer (50mM NaCl, 5 mM Tris, pH 7.5) and allowing the suspensions to equilibrate for 24 hours at 25 C. After that time, the solutions were spun down in an Eppendorff microcentrifuge at 15,000 rev/min for 2 minutes and the supernatant was carefully removed by pipette. After  
35 dilution, the ruthenium concentrations were measured by UV-

visible absorbance.

Equilibrium Dialysis: Equilibrium dialysis of the racemic metal complexes was performed against calf-thymus DNA using procedures described previously. (74) The buffer used was 5 mM Tris, 50 mM NaCl at pH 7.5. Samples were agitated on a shaker bath during equilibration which occurred after three to five days, as determined by control samples containing no DNA. After equilibration, volumes of liquid inside and outside the dialysis bags were determined (approximately 1 and 3 ml, respectively) and circular dichroism of the dialysate was measured on a Jasco J-40 spectropolarimeter. Final ruthenium concentration inside and outside the bags were measured by visible absorbance. Data analysis was performed on a VAX-780 using non-linear least squares analysis.

Topoisomerase Assay: In a typical experiment, pBR322 DNA (0.47 µg, BRL) was incubated at 37 °C for 1 h with 2 to 4 units of Topoisomerase I (from calf thymus, BRL) in reaction mixtures containing 5 mM Tris-HCl, pH 7.2, 50 mM NaCl, 1 mM MgCl<sub>2</sub>, and from 1 to 100 µM ruthenium complex (50 µl total volume). Following incubation, the mixtures were ethanol precipitated (200 µl ethanol) at -20 °C, centrifuged, and resuspended in 20 µl buffer (no Mg<sup>2+</sup>). The samples were then electrophoresed in 1% agarose for 4 to 6 h. Photographic negatives of the agarose gels were scanned on an LKB model 2202 ultrascan laser densitometer. The unwinding angles were determined graphically from plots of  $-\tau$ , where  $\tau$  equals the number of superhelical turns, versus the concentration of bound ruthenium complex, as described by Keller, (86) using the following equation: (87)

$$\sigma = 20r_c(\phi/360) = r_c\phi/18$$

where  $\sigma$  is the superhelical density of the plasmid,  $r_c$  is the amount of metal complex ions bound per nucleotide when all of the superhelices are removed, and  $\phi$  is the unwinding

angle. Bond concentrations were determined by interpolation from the Scatchard plots of equilibrium dialysis data.

# I. RESULTS

5 Equilibrium Dialysis: Equilibrium binding constants for the metal complexes with DNA may be determined classically by equilibrium dialysis. Calf thymus DNA was dialyzed against the series of mixed ligand complexes using a broad range of ruthenium concentrations. Data are shown in Figure 8 for  
10 the eight complexes which showed noncooperative binding to the polynucleotide. The results have been plotted according to Scatchard (88), where  $r$  is the ratio of bound metal to DNA-phosphate concentration, and  $c_f$  is the concentration of free metal complex. The data were fit by non-linear least  
15 squares analysis to the McGhee and von Hippel equation (8945) governing random non-cooperative binding to a lattice,

$$2r/c_f + K_b(1-2/r)[(1-2/r)/[1-2(-1)r]]^{-1}$$

20

where  $r$  is the ratio of bound concentration of ruthenium to the concentration of DNA-phosphate,  $c_f$  is the concentration of ruthenium free in solution,  $K_b$  the intrinsic binding  
25 constant, and the integer  $/$ , which measures the degree of anti-cooperativity, is the size of a binding site in base pairs. The curves shown reflect the best fit after variation of two parameters: the intrinsic binding constant,  $K_b$ , and binding site size,  $/$ . For those complexes where  
30 cooperativity was observed, the equation (89) incorporating a cooperativity parameter was used. The values obtained are summarized in Table 13.

35



DNA Binding Parameters for mixed ligand complexes of ruthenium(II)

TABLE 13

Complexes	$K_m \times 10^3$ equilibrium dialysis	$K (M \times 10^3)$ by absorption titration	Site size (base pairs)	Unwinding concentration ( $\mu M$ )	Unwinding Angle (degrees)	Enantio- selectivity
Ru(bpy) Cl	0.7(.13)	h	6-12	650		none
Ru(bpy) (phen)Cl	0.7(.07)	h	10-14	69		
Ru(phen) (bpy)Cl	2.4(.4)	4.6(1.0)	5-7	11	18	
Ru(phen)3Cl2	3.1(.1)	5.5(.99)	4	9	19	
Ru(5-Me phen) Cl	1.0(.1)	h	8-12	1		none
Ru(phen) (flone)Cl	2.1(.2)	h	9-12	1		
Ru(bpy) (DIP)Cl	1.7(.3)	h	12-18	170		
Ru(phen) (DIP)Cl	2.5(1.0)	11.2(.99)	cooperative	9		
Ru(DIP) (phen)Cl	10.1(3)	11.1(.99)	cooperative	J	J	
Ru(phen) (bpy)Cl	17.6(-)	24.4(.98)	cooperative	0.6	J	k
Ru(phen) (phi)Cl	46.(6)	46.8(.99)	2-3	1.2	26	l
	100.(37)					
Ru(bpy) (phi)Cl	160.(17)	48.0(.99)	4	1.1	17	l

a. Standard deviations are given in parentheses.

b. Correlation coefficients between observed and calculated values are given in parentheses. Values for  $K_b$  have been calculated as described in the text.

c. For this range of site sizes, less than 1% variation in correlation coefficient and standard deviation in  $K_b$  is found. For the lowest site size given, best correlation and the lowest standard deviation in  $K_b$  are obtained.

d. Concentration of ruthenium complex needed to unwind 11 of 22 supercoils. [DNA] = 47  $\mu M$  for assays of phi-containing complexes and 31.5  $\mu M$  for all others.

e. Unwinding angles represent the number of degrees by which one molecule of bound complex unwinds the DNA helical duplex. Values are calculated with some certainty only for those complexes where the binding is otherwise well-behaved.

f. Deltas represent an enantiomeric preference for the  $\Delta$  isomer in binding to DNA.

g. The lower binding constant and site size given result from fitting only those points where  $r > 0.08$ . The higher binding constant given results from inclusion of all points. Although the fit with all points included is poorer, it is probably a better overall estimate of binding affinity.

h. At the extremely low levels of binding obtained with these complexes, changes in the absorption spectrum were too small to allow for significant determinations.

i. Measurements were not conducted on this complex.

j. Measurement could not be performed due to the poor solubility of the complex.

k. A small circular dichroism was occasionally observed in the dialysate.

l. Although the dialysate showed a strong circular dichroism, and thus a clear enantiomeric selectivity in binding to DNA exists, the absolute configurations for the phi complexes cannot be inferred from simple comparison to phenanthroline complexes.

For the complexes shown, the intrinsic binding constant is seen to vary over more than two orders of magnitude. The highest binding affinity is seen for complexes which contain the phi ligand. Other variations, though of a smaller magnitude, are apparent as a function of increasing size and hydrophobicity. For example, for the series  $\text{Ru}(\text{bpy})_3^{2+}$ ,  $\text{Ru}(\text{bpy})_2(\text{phen})^{2+}$ ,  $\text{Ru}(\text{bpy})_2(\text{DIP})^{2+}$ , and  $\text{Ru}(\text{bpy})_2(\text{phi})^{2+}$ , we find  $K_b$  values of  $0.7 \times 10^3$ ,  $0.7 \times 10^3$ ,  $1.7 \times 10^3$ , and  $1.6 \times 10^5 \text{ M}^{-1}$ , respectively. The data for all the complexes fit reasonably well to a random non-cooperative model. Site sizes are found to vary between 2 and 12 base pairs, but values obtained from complexes with low binding affinity ( $K < 2 \times 10^3 \text{ M}^{-1}$ ) have a high associated uncertainty.

The bulkier and more hydrophobic complexes  $\text{Ru}(\text{phen})_2(\text{DIP})^{2+}$ ,  $\text{Ru}(\text{DIP})_2(\text{phen})^{2+}$  and  $\text{Ru}(\text{phi})_2(\text{bpy})^{2+}$  all showed curves indicative of cooperative binding. This observation is understandable, since these complexes tend to aggregate in solution. Thus the equilibrium involves not only bound and free monomer complexes but those involving self-stacked dimers (or even larger aggregates). Furthermore, a similar aggregation of the complexes along the DNA strands is likely. Some samples actually showed precipitation, and these were not included. The extensive aggregation of  $\text{Ru}(\text{DIP})_3^{2+}$  and  $\text{Ru}(\text{phi})_3^{2+}$  completely precluded their incorporation in these studies.

Equilibrium dialysis experiments additionally offer the opportunity to examine any enantiomeric selectivities associated with binding. After dialysis of the DNA against the racemic mixture, optical activity observed in the dialysate reflects an enrichment in the dialysate in the less favored enantiomer. For most of the complexes, optical activity was found in the dialysate. Values for the extent of enantiomeric selectivity could not be quantitated in the

absence of determinations of DE and assignments of absolute configuration. Assuming that the signs of the circular dichroism in the ultraviolet ligand bands are the same for these ligands as that for the parent phenanthroline complex, (90) we have assigned the absolute configuration of these complexes by comparison to spectra for enantiomers of  $\text{Ru}(\text{phen})_3^{2+}$  and have compared levels of enantioselectivity qualitatively through measurements of circular dichroic intensity per ruthenium bound. Based upon these assumptions, we find enantiomeric selectivities for the polypyridyl complexes to reflect an enrichment in the isomer in the dialysate and the preferential binding of the isomer to the right-handed DNA. This observation is consistent with the preferential intercalation of isomers found earlier for  $\text{Ru}(\text{phen})_3^{2+}$  in right-handed B-DNA. (63) We may also compare relative enantioselectivities for different ancillary ligands. For the pairs,  $\text{Ru}(\text{phen})_2\text{phi}^{2+}$  versus  $\text{Ru}(\text{bpy})_2\text{phi}^{2+}$ , for example, the intensity in circular dichroism per ruthenium bound is more than three times greater with phen as the ancillary ligand than with bpy. The same comparison may be seen qualitatively between  $\text{Ru}(\text{phen})_2\text{DIP}^{2+}$  and  $\text{Ru}(\text{bpy})_2\text{DIP}^{2+}$ . The exceptions, where no enantiomeric discrimination is apparent, are  $\text{Ru}(\text{phi})_2\text{bpy}^{2+}$ ,  $\text{Ru}(\text{bpy})_3^{2+}$ , and  $\text{Ru}(\text{phen})_2(\text{flone})^{2+}$ . For  $\text{Ru}(\text{phi})_2\text{bpy}^{2+}$ , aggregation of the complex and its poor solubility made the determinations problematic. In the cases of  $\text{Ru}(\text{bpy})_3^{2+}$  and  $\text{Ru}(\text{phen})_2(\text{flone})^{2+}$ , the low levels of binding and small size of the complex may preclude observation of any selectivity.

Spectroscopic Changes on Binding to DNA: The complexes all possess intense optical absorption owing to their well-characterized metal to ligand charge transfer band. Furthermore, for all the complexes, this electronic transition is perturbed on binding to DNA. Table 14 summarizes the spectroscopic properties for the complexes and some of the changes observed.

SPECTROSCOPIC PROPERTIES ON BINDING TO DNA

TABLE 14

COMPLEX	Absorption $\lambda_{max}$ (nm)		Emission $\lambda_{max}$ (nm)		$E_{ext}$ (M <sup>-1</sup> cm <sup>-1</sup> )	Emission Enhancement (I/I <sub>0</sub> )	Emission Lifetime (nanoseconds) free bound <sup>d</sup>
	free bound	$\Delta\lambda$	free bound	$\Delta\lambda$			
Ru(bpy) <sub>3</sub> <sup>2+</sup>	450	450 0	615 618	3	14,600	1.06	420
Ru(bpy) <sub>2</sub> (phen) <sup>2+</sup>	452	452 0	611 602	-9	16,000	1.12	450 430±30(1) 2100±300(2)
Ru(phen) <sub>2</sub> (bpy) <sup>2+</sup>	446	448 2	608 604	-4	19,200	1.43	555 530±30(1) 2100±260(2)
Ru(phen) <sub>3</sub> <sup>2+</sup>	443	445 2	591 593	2	20,000	1.87	530 630±70(1) 2300±620(2)
Ru(5-NO <sub>2</sub> phen) <sub>3</sub> <sup>2+</sup>	450	454 4	b	-	20,000 <sup>c</sup>	-	-
Ru(phen) <sub>2</sub> (flone) <sup>2+</sup>	436	436 0	b	-	18,800	-	-
Ru(bpy) <sub>2</sub> (DIP) <sup>2+</sup>	454	454 0	615 621	6	18,600	1.13	700 640±40(1) 4700±600(2)
Ru(phen) <sub>2</sub> (DIP) <sup>2+</sup>	427 <sup>a</sup>	432 5	614 606	-8	20,550	2.06	970 1160±30(1) 5290±80(2)
Ru(DIP) <sub>2</sub> (phen) <sup>2+</sup>	433	439 6	616 621	+5	29,400	2.14	990 1160±40(1) 5100±430(2)
Ru(phi) <sub>2</sub> (bpy) <sup>2+</sup>	572	582 10	b	-	75,300	-	-
Ru(phen) <sub>2</sub> (phi) <sup>2+</sup>	535	544 9	b	-	51,900	-	-
Ru(bpy) <sub>2</sub> (phi) <sup>2+</sup>	535	548 13	b	-	48,000	-	-

a. The double-humped charge transfer bands characteristic of ruthenium polypyridyl complexes are such that the higher energy band of Ru(phen)<sub>2</sub>(DIP)<sup>2+</sup> and Ru(DIP)<sub>2</sub>(phen)<sup>2+</sup> is the more intense and is therefore defined as the  $\lambda_{max}$  of the complex.

b. Nonemissive complexes. Ru(bpy)<sub>2</sub>(phi)<sup>2+</sup> was previously reported<sup>13</sup> to luminesce at 620 nm, but in our hands this was found to be due to

Ru(bpy)<sub>3</sub><sup>2+</sup> contamination.

c. Extinction coefficient for Ru(5-NO<sub>2</sub>-phen)<sub>3</sub><sup>2+</sup> was taken from reference 15.

d. (1) and (2) denote first and second components of emission lifetime decay.

For those complexes which luminesce, changes in luminescence on DNA binding are found. Increases in emission are apparent with DNA binding, and depending upon the mixed ligand complex examined, red shifts or blue shifts in the emission spectra are observed (vide infra). As was seen earlier for  $\text{Ru}(\text{phen})_3^{2+}$  and  $\text{Ru}(\text{DIP})_3^{2+}$ , (29,30) the decay in emission from the excited ruthenium complex in the presence of DNA is best characterized by a biexponential, with one component having an emission lifetime characteristic of the free ruthenium species, and one longer lived component. For  $\text{Ru}(\text{phen})_3^{2+}$  and  $\text{Ru}(\text{DIP})_3^{2+}$ , this long lived component was characterized extensively and found to correspond to emission from the intercalatively bound species, the emission lifetime for the surface bound species was found to be indistinguishable from the free form. We suggest that the two components may be assigned similarly for these mixed ligand complexes. Moreover the similarity in spectroscopic perturbations seen with the mixed ligand complexes on binding to DNA supports the notion that these complexes also bind to DNA in a similar fashion.

The emission spectra and decay traces therefore suggest that the mixed ligand complexes all bind to DNA through the mixture of two binding modes: intercalation and surface binding. The emission enhancements provide some gauge of the extent of intercalation as well as binding affinity. After corrections for the differing affinities of phen and DIP mixed ligand complexes, from these data it appears that the intercalative component is actually quite comparable among the series. Quantitation of the surface versus intercalative components could not be made, however.

The binding of intercalative drugs to DNA has also been characterized classically through absorption titrations, following the hypochromism and red shift associated with binding of the colored complex to the helix. (91) Figure 9

displays a well-behaved titration of  $\text{Ru}(\text{phen})_2(\text{phi})^{2+}$  with calf thymus DNA. Isosbestic points are observed at 558nm and 598 nm. The spectra show clearly that addition of DNA yields hypochromism and a large red shift in the charge-transfer band of the complex. These spectral characteristics are attributable to a mode of binding which involves a strong stacking interaction between an aromatic chromophore and the base pairs of DNA.

The magnitudes of the red shift and hypochromism are furthermore commonly found to correlate with the strength of the interaction. (91) A comparison of red shifts found with DNA binding can be seen in Table 14. Complexes containing phi have the longest red shifts ( $\leq 13$  nm), followed by DIP complexes ( $\leq 6$ nm), phen complexes ( $2 \leq$ nm), and bpy complexes (no red shift). Thus, if red shifts upon binding are taken as a measure of stacking interaction, a trend can be observed in which the optimal shape for intercalation is  $\text{phi} > \text{DIP} > \text{phen} > \text{bpy}$ .

The degree of hypochromism generally correlates well also with overall binding strength. Figure 10 shows absorption titration data for the series of complexes as a function of DNA addition. The extent of hypochromicity in the charge transfer band as a function of DNA binding, plotted reciprocally as  $A_0/A$  versus  $[\text{Ru}]/[\text{DNA}]$ , is found to provide a good measure of relative binding affinity, since the hypochromicity found for the series of complexes per DNA added parallels nicely the binding results by equilibrium dialysis.  $\text{Ru}(\text{bpy})_2(\text{phi})^{2+}$ , a soluble complex of high binding strength to DNA, and the more hydrophobic complexes  $\text{Ru}(\text{phen})_2(\text{DIP})^{2+}$ ,  $\text{Ru}(\text{DIP})_2(\text{phen})^{2+}$  and  $\text{Ru}(\text{phi})_2(\text{bpy})^{2+}$  show the greatest change in absorption with DNA addition. The latter three complexes, however, are only sparingly soluble in the buffer solution and may show increased hypochromism owing to aggregation, both in solution and bound to the helix.

complexes which bind only weakly to DNA, such as  $\text{Ru}(\text{bpy})_3^{2+}$  and  $\text{Ru}(\text{bpy})_2(\text{phen})^{2+}$ , are seen to show little hypochromic effect.

Determinations of intrinsic binding constant,  $K_b$ , based upon these absorption (92)

$$[\text{DNA}]/(\epsilon_A - \epsilon_f) = [\text{DNA}]/(\epsilon_B - \epsilon_f) + 1/K_b(\epsilon_B - \epsilon_f)$$

where  $\epsilon_A$ ,  $\epsilon_f$  and  $\epsilon_B$  correspond to  $A_{\text{obs}}/[\text{Ru}]$ , the extinction coefficient for the free ruthenium complex, and the extinction coefficient for the ruthenium complex in the fully bound form, respectively. In plots of  $[\text{DNA}]/(\epsilon_A - \epsilon_f)$  versus  $[\text{DNA}]$ ,  $K_b$  is given by the ratio of the slope to intercept. This half-reciprocal absorption titration method, which has been used successfully to determine the intrinsic  $K_b$  of molecules as hydrophobic as benzo[a]pyrene derivatives, (48) was found to provide a useful route to obtain intrinsic binding constants for the broad range of ruthenium complex of differing solubilities. Values for  $K_b$ , given in Table 13, we obtained for all but those complexes which bound very weakly, the compounds  $\text{Ru}(\text{bpy})_3^{2+}$ ,  $\text{Ru}(\text{bpy})_2(\text{phen})^{2+}$ ,  $\text{Ru}(\text{bpy})_2(\text{DIP})^{2+}$ ,  $\text{Ru}(\text{5NO}_2\text{-phen})_3$ , and  $\text{Ru}(\text{phen})_2(\text{flone})^{2+}$  showed such small changes in their absorption spectra upon DNA addition, that the resultant error in  $\epsilon_A - \epsilon_f$  was large. For the remainder, as shown in Table 13, good correlation with those values obtained by dialysis was found.

Unwinding of Supercoiled DNA: The amount to helical unwinding induced by a complex bound to closed circular DNA provides another measure of intercalative binding. (92,93) Helix unwinding by a non-covalently bound species is determined by observing the change in superhelical density in a plasmid, after relaxation of the plasmid in the presence of bound complex by topoisomerase I and then removal of the complex. The helix unwinding angle is defined as the number of degrees of base pair unwinding per complex bound

(see experimental). Figure 11 shows the change in incubation with increasing concentrations of  $\text{Ru}(\text{bpy})_2(\text{phi})^{2+}$  in the presence of topoisomerase. Table 14 includes both the concentration of ruthenium complex added to unwind the plasmid 50% (11 out of 22 supercoils removed), and, for those  
5 complexes which show well behaved binding parameters, the corresponding unwinding angle per complex bound.

Several trends are apparent from these data. First, those complexes with appreciable binding affinity show reasonable  
10 values for the unwinding consistent with intercalation.  $\text{Ru}(\text{phen})_3^{2+}$  and  $\text{Ru}(\text{phen})_2(\text{phi})^{2+}$  display unwinding angles of  $19^\circ$  (50) and  $26^\circ$ , respectively, and these may be compared to that of  $26^\circ$ , found for ethidium (87), a classical DNA intercalator. For the complexes which bind with lower  
15 overall binding strength, unwinding angles could not be reliably determined. The data indicate, however, the inverse correlation between binding constant and concentration of complex required for a constant amount of unwinding. Therefore it is likely that, for this series of  
20 weaker binding molecules, the unwinding angle per complex bound is quite similar. It is noteworthy that bound concentrations reflect both intercalation and surface binding and thus if surface binding contributes little to the unwinding, those complexes with a greater percentage in  
25 the surface bound form will show reduced apparent unwinding angles.  $\text{Ru}(\text{bpy})_3^{2+}$ , which based upon spectroscopic results, neither intercalates nor surface-binds to the helix, shows little significant unwinding of the helix. The complexes  $\text{Ru}(\text{DIP})_2(\text{phen})^{2+}$  and  $\text{Ru}(\text{phi})_2(\text{bpy})^{2+}$  proved to be too  
30 insoluble for application of the unwinding assay. For the complexes possessing high binding affinity, a larger certainty in bound concentration and therefore unwinding angle exists. Here some effect of the ancillary ligand may be seen  $\text{Ru}(\text{phen})_2(\text{phi})^{2+}$ , suggesting that the larger  
35 ancillary phen ligands may contribute to unwinding of the



helix.

#### Effects of DNA Binding seen by Excited State Resonance Raman Spectroscopy:

5 The effects of DNA binding on the electronic structure of the complexes may also be probed by excited state resonance Raman spectroscopy, and this technique has provided some novel evidence in support of intercalative binding. Figure 12 shows spectra for  $\text{Ru}(\text{bpy})_2\text{DIP}^{2+}$  in the absence and  
10 presence of DNA. In the spectra of mixed ligand complexes, transitions were assigned earlier to excited states localized either on bpy or DIP. (95) Thus, the presence of an equilibrium between the two localized excited states was established. In particular the transitions centered at  $1215\text{ cm}^{-1}$   
15 are dominated by  $\text{bpy}^*$ . This equilibrium can be shifted on binding to DNA. In the presence of DNA, the intensity of the transitions corresponding to  $\text{bpy}^*$  are considerably decreased relative to those for  $\text{DIP}^*$ . Remarkably, though not covalently bound, the association with DNA sufficiently  
20 perturbs the excited state electronic structure of the complex for detection by this technique. We interpret that decrease in  $\text{bpy}^*$  excited state equilibrium toward  $\text{DIP}^*$ . For this mixed ligand complex, only the DIP ligand, rather than bpy, is expected to intercalate into the helix. Perhaps as  
25 a result of binding to DNA, the energy of  $\text{DIP}^*$  is lowered more so than is bpy with charge transfer occurring preferentially onto the intercalated DIP ligand.

30 One may also understand the red and blue shifts in emission associated with binding to DNA by the mixed ligand complexes by considering these shifts in equilibria. For  $\text{Ru}(\text{bpy})_2\text{DIP}^{2+}$ , the lower energy excited state involves transfer to the DIP ligand. (95) If DIP is the intercalating ligand, this state is lowered in energy, and,  
35 consistent with this idea, a red shift (10 nm) in emission

is observed. In the case of  $\text{Ru}(\text{bpy})_2\text{phen}^{2+}$ , the lower energy excited state involves charge transfer onto the bpy ligand. (95) Since the phen ligand is the one which would intercalate and thus be lowered in energy, an overall blue shift of 9 nm is observed. The same arguments may explain the shifts observed for  $\text{Ru}(\text{phen})_2\text{bpy}^{2+}$  and  $\text{Ru}(\text{DIP})_2\text{phen}^{2+}$ . For  $\text{Ru}(\text{phen})_2\text{DIP}^{2+}$  the direction of the shift found is unexpected, but this may reflect underlying contributions from surface binding.

## 10 II. $\text{Rh}(\text{phi})_2(\text{bpy})^{3+}$ Footprinting of Distamycin Results

Footprinting of distamycin of a 5'-end-labeled DNA fragment is shown in Figure 15a. Brackets denote regions where the DNA is protected from  $\text{Rh}(\text{phi})_2(\text{bpy})^{3+}$  cleavage by distamycin. A clear, sharp footprint is seen at the strong  $A_g$  binding site (41-47 bp) for distamycin and also at weaker distamycin binding sites AATT (67-70, 119-12), TAAT (73-76), AAATT (101-105), and TTAT (107-110). On the 3'-end-labeled fragment, corresponding results are obtained. At a higher concentration of distamycin (25  $\mu\text{M}$ , drug/base pair ration = 1) and a lower concentration of the rhodium complex (6.5  $\mu\text{M}$ , metal/base pair ration = 0.26), a weak ATAT site and sites containing three AT base pairs can also be footprinted. Figure 15 b shows densitometer traces of  $\text{Rh}(\text{phi})_2(\text{bpy})^{3+}$  cleavage in the presence and absence of distamycin. Densitometer data were also manipulated as described in Materials and Methods to yield Figure 13c, a representation of high resolution footprinting at the  $A_g$  site by  $\text{Rh}(\text{phi})_2(\text{bpy})^{3+}$  on both strands. For the 5'-end-labeled fragment, 5 bases (42-46) are strongly protected from cleavage and 2 bases (41 and 47) are weakly protected. For the 3'-end-labeled fragment, 6(41-46) and 1 (40) positions are strongly and weakly protected from cleavage, respectively. The protected region shows a single nucleotide shift to the 3' side, which is to be distinguished from the 2-3 pair 3'- shifts for footprinting of distamycin

by MPE-Fe(II) or Cu(phen)<sub>2</sub>.

Rh(phi)<sub>2</sub>(bpy)<sup>3+</sup> Footprinting of EcoRI

Figure 16a shows the footprinting of EcoRI by Rh(phi)<sub>2</sub>(bpy)<sup>3+</sup> on 5'-(lanes A-D) and 3'-(lanes E-F) end-labeled fragments. A sharp footprint of the protein is clearly evident. Light bands within the footprint on the 3'-labeled strand can be observed but they are apparent also in the light control (not shown). Densitometer scans are shown in Figure 16b for cleavage by Rh(phi)<sub>2</sub>(bpy)<sup>3+</sup> in the presence and absence of EcoRI, and Figure 16c shows the values of  $(I_c - I_e)/I_c$  for each band on both 3' and 5'-end-labeled strands. It is apparent from Figure 16c that the footprinted region about the EcoRI site is 12 bases (64-75) in length on the 5'-end-labeled strands and 10 bases (64-73) on the 3'-end-labeled strand. These footprinted regions are much smaller than those obtained with DNase I (17-18 base pairs) (18) and are in good agreement with the x-ray co-crystallographic data, where the protein is seen to be in contact with the DNA over 10 base pairs (24). A distinct asymmetry in cleavage either to the 3'-or 5' side is not evident here with the rhodium complex.

Footprinting experiments were also conducted with Rh(phi)<sub>2</sub>(bpy)<sup>3+</sup> with the transilluminator is shown in Figure 17. Despite slightly greater DNA light damage using this alternative light source, the footprinted region again spans 10 base pairs (64-73), which is in excellent agreement with results obtained using the Hg/Xe lamp. It is noteworthy that some hyperactivity by the rhodium complex is evident within the binding site in the absence of protein, and this reactivity, though reduced, is still present to some extent in the presence of protein (position 66). Nonetheless, densitometer scanning and subtraction of light controls yields footprints of equally high resolution to those obtained with a high power lamp.

Establishment of Optimal Conditions for Cleavage by  
 $\text{Rh}(\text{phi})_2(\text{bpy})_3^+$


In order to establish the effect of different reaction conditions on the sequence-neutrality and intensity of  $\text{Rh}(\text{phi})_2(\text{bpy})_3^+$  cleavage, a series of experiments to characterize the cleavage were also conducted. The effect of varying the metal/base pair ratio is shown in Figure 18 (lanes H-L and O), together with the effect of irradiation time (lanes F-H and L-N) and irradiation power (lanes J and R-V). As the  $\text{Rh}/\text{DNA}$  ratio decreases, cleavage by the complex shows increasing sequence selectivity. Although no clear consensus sequence is evident, sequences such as 5'-TATG-3' (51-48 and 37-34 bp) as well as, more generally, alternating purine-pyrimidine sequences are cleaved more strongly relative to background at low concentrations of  $\text{Rh}(\text{phi})_2(\text{bpy})_3^+$ . DNA cleavage by the complex at such alternating sequences is still efficient at rhodium concentrations as low as 50 nM. Cleavage at pyrimidine bases is slightly more efficient than at purine bases. At metal/base pair ratios of  $> 0.5$ , however, the cleavage reaction is almost completely sequence neutral, and certainly random enough for purposes of footprinting.

Unlike the effect of varying the metal/base pair ratio, differences in irradiation time or power do not cause change in cleavage specificity of the metal complex. As can be seen from Figure 18, changes in irradiation time or power are roughly proportional to the extent of cleavage. Varying the wavelength of irradiation also causes only little change in cleavage pattern. Shorter wavelength light (300-320 nm) is much more efficient for activating  $\text{Rh}(\text{phi})_2(\text{bpy})_3^+$  than is longer-wavelength light (340-365 nm). It is impractical to use light below 310 nm, however, because photodamage in the absence of the rhodium complex occurs, which introduces background noise.

The effect of different buffers on the cleavage reaction was also examined at pH7 (data now shown). No changes in specificity or intensity of the cleavage reaction are observed in any of the following buffers at pH7: (1) 50 mM sodium cacodylate(-HCl), (2) 50 mM potassium phosphate, (3) 50 mM Tris(-HCl), and (4) 50 mM Tris(-HCl), 20 mM sodium acetate, and 18 mM sodium chloride. When the reaction is carried out at pH 6 (50 mM sodium cacodylate buffer) or pH 8 (50 mM Tris(-HCl)buffer), there are few detectable differences in the  $\text{Rh}(\text{phi})_2(\text{bpy})^{3+}$  cleavage pattern. Sequence-neutrality of the photocleavage reaction is also unaffected by the temperature of incubation varied from 0°C to 37°C.

Effect of Commonly Used Biochemical Reagents on Cleavage by  $\text{Rh}(\text{phi})_2(\text{bpy})^{3+}$

The effect of various salts ( $\text{NaCl}$ ,  $\text{MgCl}_2$ ,  $\text{CaCl}_2$ ) on the photocleavage reaction is shown in Figure 19 (lanes F-O). The photocleavage reaction is not inhibited in 100 mM  $\text{NaCl}$ , 10 mM  $\text{MgCl}_2$ , or 10 mM  $\text{CaCl}_2$ , salt concentrations necessary for in vivo applications and sometimes required with particular DNA-binding proteins. At higher concentrations of these salts, specific bands become apparent and these are identical to those observed at low  $\text{Rh}(\text{phi})_2(\text{bpy})^{3+}$  concentration, consistent with a decrease in binding affinity at very high salt concentrations. Cleavage is not altered in the presence of 1 mM EDTA, although some GC selectivity is apparent in the presence of 10-1000 mM EDTA (figures 5 lanes P-R). Dithiothreitol at concentrations of 1mM or higher causes only slight changes in relative band intensities while another reducing agent, 3-mercaptopropionic acid, has no effect up to 10 mM (data not shown). Bovine serum albumin (60  $\mu\text{l/ml}$ ) or 10% glycerol (Figure 20 lanes S-U) has no affect on photocleavage by



### Discussion

5 The result of these varied experiments on the series of mixed ligand complexes of ruthenium(II), when taken together, provide a detailed picture of factors affecting noncovalent binding of the complexes to the helix. The complexes, excepting  $\text{Ru}(\text{bpy})_3^{2+}$ , all appear to intercalate and surface-binding into DNA. This conclusion is based upon  
10 the effects of hypochromism, the increases in emission intensities and excited state lifetimes, the helical unwinding, and the excited state resonance Raman experiment. (96) The chiral discrimination found in binding these complexes to DNA lends further support to the intercalative binding model and more specifically to the notion that the  
15 binding of this family of rigid complexes with respect to the helix is likely to be quite similar. (97) In this series of mixed ligand complexes, we have varied geometry, hydrophobicity, size, dipole moments, and hydrogen bonding  
20 ability, and we may therefore examine how each of these factors contribute to DNA binding.

Intercalation and Surface Binding: For the mixed ligand complexes, the tendencies of each of the ligands to  
25 intercalate may be compared. For the series  $\text{RuX}_2\text{bpy}^{2+}$ ,  $\text{RuX}_2\text{phen}^{2+}$ ,  $\text{RuX}_2\text{phen}^{2+}$ ,  $\text{RuX}_2\text{DIP}^{2+}$ ,  $\text{RuX}_2\text{phi}^{2+}$ , where the ancillary, non-intercalated ligands, X, are kept constant, the binding constants increase in the series  $\text{bpy} \ll \text{phen} \ll \text{DIP} \ll \text{phi}$ . This variation likely reflects the differing ability of the  
30 ligands to stack and overlap well with the base pairs. The phi ligand is flat, large in surface area, and has a geometry which permits substantial overlap with the base pairs (rather than one where the majority of the  $\pi$  orbital framework would lie in the center of the helix, between the  
35 DNA bases). Hence the phi ligand is well suited for

intercalation, and for mixed ligand complexes it would be the  $\phi$  ligand which would be expected preferentially to intercalate. The DIP ligand, similar in expanse to that of  $\phi$ , is not expected to be flat, with phenyl groups instead twisted out of the phenanthroline plane, (98) and this lack of planarity diminishes the favorability of the ligand for intercalation. Nonetheless, the data are consistent with intercalation by this ligand. The DIP ligand, moreover, may be favored over phen for intercalation into the helix. Binding data from absorption titrations for  $\text{Ru}(\text{phen})_3^{2+}$  and  $\text{Ru}(\text{phen})_2\text{DIP}^{2+}$  show increased binding affinity upon substitution with DIP, and both emission enhancements and red shifts in absorption are greater for analogous DIP versus phen complexes. That this affinity derives from intercalation rather than from added hydrophobic surface binding is not definitively established, however, and therefore the relative intercalative ability of DIP versus phen complexes is difficult to assess. The phen ligand can, nonetheless, also intercalate into the helix, though the ancillary ligands preclude substantial overlap with the base pairs. Inspection of models shows that, owing to the overhanging hydrogen atoms (2 and 3 positions) from the ancillary ligands, only the outer third of the phenanthroline ligand (5 and 6 positions) is available for stacking. Thus only a partial insertion of the ligand is likely. For bpy, this stacking region is absent. On this basis, it is reasonable to understand why the bpy ligand shows only an electrostatic association with DNA, and no detectable intercalation.

Effects of Ancillary Ligands: The primary effect of the ancillary ligand is in altering the extent of enantioselectivity. As was found earlier (29) in comparisons of  $\text{Ru}(\text{phen})_3^{2+}$  and  $\text{Ru}(\text{DIP})_3^{2+}$ , increased steric bulk of the ancillary ligand increases the enantioselectivity for intercalation of the isomer into

right-handed DNA. Given intercalation into the helix by one ligand, we can also compare how different ancillary ligands add to or detract from the overall binding affinity. One bulky hydrophobic ligand which can intercalate adds to the stability of the bound complex, but the second bulky ligand, which would necessarily occupy the ancillary position, perpendicular to the groove, adds no further stability. Ru(DIP)<sub>2</sub>phen<sup>2+</sup> shows binding similar to that of Ru(phen)<sub>2</sub>DIP<sup>2+</sup>, and Ru(phi)<sub>2</sub>bpy<sup>2+</sup>, actually displays decreased affinity for DNA relative to Ru(bpy)<sub>2</sub>ph<sup>2+</sup>. For these ancillary ligands, steric interactions may interfere with how deeply the intercalated ligand may stack into the helix. Additionally, the increased hydrophobicity of the complexes leads to selfstacking in solution, and this effect may reduce the net binding affinity. (91) Interestingly, symmetric substitutions provide a different picture. In comparing Ru(bpy)<sub>2</sub>phen<sup>2+</sup> with Ru(phen)<sub>3</sub><sup>2+</sup>, or Ru(bpy)<sub>2</sub>DIP<sup>2+</sup> with Ru(phen)<sub>2</sub>DIP<sup>2+</sup>, one finds increased DNA binding affinity with increasing hydrophobicity of the ancillary ligands. (100) This observation may in part reflect a greater tendency of phen for surface binding. However the orientations of the intercalated complexes will certainly affect their ability to exclude water from the hydrophobic surfaces of the ancillary ligands, and this may be particularly important in stabilizing symmetric binding molecules.

Hydrogen Bonding: The series of complexes studied also afford the opportunity to examine whether substitutions of ligands which contain potentially hydrogen bonding groups stabilize the complexes bound to DNA. Both the red shift in absorption titrations and the finding of enantioselective binding of the [ ] isomer suggest that Ru(5-NO<sub>2</sub>-phen)<sub>3</sub><sup>2+</sup> may bind to DNA intercalatively. One might have expected that with the larger heterocyclic surface of 5-NO<sub>2</sub>-phen, the ligand might even have been favored for intercalation. Inspection of models suggests that if intercalated, or



indeed even if surface bound, the nitro-groups on the ancillary ligands could be aligned appropriately for hydrogen bonding to base positions. The complex, however, bind only poorly to DNA. In fact the binding constant is comparable to that of  $\text{Ru}(\text{bpy})_3^{2+}$  and thus the major source of stabilization is likely to be electrostatic. A similar conclusion may be drawn based upon a comparison of binding constant of  $\text{Ru}(\text{phen})_2\text{bpy}^{2+}$  and  $\text{Ru}(\text{phen})_2\text{flone}^{2+}$ . For the diazafluorenone ligand, the oxygen atom is oriented perpendicular to the main axis of phenanthroline and thus the orientation of the hydrogen bonding acceptor relative to that of either groove containing hydrogen bonding donors differs from that in  $\text{Ru}(5\text{-NO}_2\text{-phen})_3^{2+}$ . Yet, again no increased stabilization is detected. Instead the binding affinity for  $\text{Ru}(\text{phen})_2\text{flone}^{2+}$  is indistinguishable from that for  $\text{Ru}(\text{phen})_2\text{bpy}^{2+}$ . It appears, then, that the substitution of potential hydrogen bonding acceptors onto the phenanthroline ligands provides no additional source of stabilization. The same observation applies to our single example of a hydrogen bonding donor on an ancillary ligand,  $\text{Ru}(\text{phi})_2\text{bpy}^{2+}$ . For this complex, equilibrium binding constants are in the range of those for  $\text{Ru}(\text{phen})_2\text{phi}^{2+}$ .

Thus, although specific hydrogen interactions along the DNA helix are possible, there is apparently no net increase bonding stabilization relative to that where the DNA and complex are independently solvated. In binding to DNA, some new hydrogen bonds between DNA and complex may be made, but these are at the expense of hydrogen bonds for each with solvent.

Overall Factors Contributing to Stabilization: If one compares the various factors that contribute to stabilizing the metal complexes on the DNA helix, it appears that the most significant factor is that of molecular shape. Those complexes which fit most closely against the DNA helical

structure, those in which Van der Waals interactions between complex and DNA maximized, display highest binding affinity. The phi ligand, for example, is constructed to provide substantial overlap of its aromatic surface with that of the DNA base pairs, and binding constants for those complexes with phi is intercalated ligand show more than two orders of magnitude increase in binding affinity. The phi ligand is not well suited as an ancillary substitution by DIP rather than by phi. This notion is further exemplified in the differences between symmetrically and non-symmetrically arranged ancillary ligands, or even more simply in comparisons of binding modes and affinities for then versus bpy complexes.

Table 15 summarizes two characteristics of the complexes which may be useful to consider: their solubility in buffer and their water accessible surface areas. (101) Some correlations between these parameters and the intrinsic binding constants of the complexes may be made, and also some deviations are apparent. Certainly the hydrophobicity of a complex appears to be an important criterion in determining binding affinity. Those complexes with more surface area for interactions with DNA and for which interactions with DNA rather than with water are favored display higher overall intrinsic binding constants. Hydrogen bonding functionalities do not appear to be critical to overall binding stability. Indeed,  $\text{Ru}(5\text{-NO}_2\text{-phen})_3^{2+}$  and  $\text{Ru}(\text{phen})_2^{2+}$  flone show binding affinities much lower than would be expected based upon their solvent accessible surfaces. Since binding to DNA limits hydrogen bonding interactions of the free complex with water, the overall free energy change in binding to DNA is reduced by this factor. In contrast, the free energy change in binding to DNA is increased for hydrophobic complexes because of the entropy gain associated with release of water solvating the hydrophobic ligands. Binding affinities for the DIP

complexes are, however, not as high as would be expected based upon calculations of accessible surface area, and this is likely because the ligand is not planar. Hydrophobicity is an important factor, but the shape of the complex, the disposition of ligands relative to the helix and how the  
5. ligands fit against the DNA surface, appears to be critical for both intercalative and surface-bound interactions.

10

15

20

25

30

35

**TABLE 15: Characteristic Of Complexes**

	Complex	Solubilities Water-Accessible in Buffer <sup>a</sup> Surface Area <sup>b</sup>	
		(mM)	(A <sup>2</sup> )
5	Ru(bpy) <sub>3</sub> <sup>2+</sup>	94 (4.4)	687.3
	Ru(bpy) 2 (phen) 2+	200 (24.)	702.6
	Ru(phen) 2 (bpy) 2+	133. (1.8)	719.6
	Ru(phen) <sub>3</sub> 2+	159. (5.3)	736.7
10	Ru(5-N02phen) 32+	28.2 (.27)	862.6
	Ru(phen) 2 (flone) 2+	60. (2.2)	738.9
	Ru(bpy) 2 (DIP) 2+	73. (2.5)	916.4
	Ru(phen) 2 (DIP) 2+	9. (1.2)	950.2
15	Ru(DIP) 2 (phen) 2+	0.18 (.01)	1166.7
	Ru(bpy) 2 (phi) 2+	15. (2.0)	768.3
	Ru(phen) 2 (phi) 2+	0.17 (.01)	809.4
20	Ru(phi) 2 (bpy) 2+	0.018 (.001)	854.0

a. Measured from saturated solutions in 5mMTris, 50 mM NaCl, pH 7.5 after 24 hrs., 25 C. Solubilities are given for the chloride salts. Standard deviations are given in parentheses.

b. See reference 36.

Shape and hydrophobicity are likely to be important factors governing also the ability of other small molecules to bind to DNA, as well. It must be noted, however, that these studies do not directly provide insight into those factors which may govern differential DNA site-selectivity. Site-specific DNA cleavage studies using analogous mixed ligand complexes of rhodium (III) are in progress to address that issue.

Utility of Translocation Metal Complexes: Coordination chemistry could play a unique role in the development of new compounds which bind site-specifically to biopolymers. Given the structural flexibility and variable dimensionality of transition metal complexes, one may design and readily prepare a different repertoire of shapes for interaction with DNA than those obtained through organic synthesis alone. Mixed ligand complexes of ruthenium(II) are particularly well suited to these systematic investigations of recognition. The octahedral transition metal ion provides the core, in fact a chiral center, for a rigid well defined structure of coordinated ligands. The ligands may be varied in a synthetically convenient fashion to produce a family of substitutionally inert DNA bonding molecules, with a range of ligand functionalities. The intense coloration and rich excited state properties of the complexes provide a sensitive spectroscopic handle to monitor binding interactions. These and similar complexes may therefore be useful also in studies of recognition of other biopolymers.

Figure 18 summarizes the footprinting results using  $\text{Rh}(\text{phi})_2(\text{bpy})^{3+}$  at both the distamycin and EcoRI binding sites on the restriction fragment examined. It is apparent that  $\text{Rh}(\text{phi})_2(\text{bpy})^{3+}$  produces well defined, highly resolved footprints of both a small peptide binding in the minor groove and a large DNA-binding protein. The binding sites delineated by the rhodium footprints both for distamycin and EcoRI are in excellent agreement with the crystallographic data for these DNA-binding molecules in cocrystals with oligonucleotides (24,25). The crystal structures indicate that distamycin and EcoRI having binding site sizes of six and ten, respectively. The footprints obtained with  $\text{Rh}(\text{phi})_2(\text{bpy})^{3+}$  therefore are among the most precise observed thus far using footprinting methodology. Importantly the resolution is maintained even when  $\text{Rh}(\text{phi})_2(\text{bpy})^{3+}$  is photoactivated using a simple transilluminator, making this technique accessible to almost any molecular biology laboratory.

20

There are several features of the photocleavage reaction promoted by  $\text{Rh}(\text{phi})_2(\text{bpy})^{3+}$  which contribute to the resolution and clarity of its footprints. The first important characteristic for any successful footprinting reagent is the sequence neutrality in its cleavage.  $\text{Rh}(\text{phi})_2(\text{bpy})^{3+}$  cleaves DNA quite uniformly; some sequence selectivity is apparent with the reagent only at nanomolar concentrations. Since cleavage is obtained at all nucleotides, single-nucleotide footprinting resolution is possible. Two interrelated features likely to be important in achieving the sharpness of the rhodium footprint are the rigidity of the complex and its apparent lack of a diffusing species to mediate the cleavage reaction. Mechanistic studies of phi complexes of rhodium(III) suggest that cleavage occurs as a result of a direct hydrogen abstraction

35

from the sugar by a ligand radical generated by photolysis. cleavage reactions with  $(\text{Rh}(\text{phen})_2\text{phi})^{3+}$ , a close analogue which shows some sequence selectivity, furthermore reveals single nucleotide cuts rather than a distribution of cuts at each binding site as is common with reagents that cleave DNA in reactions mediated by hydroxyl radicals (26) or single oxygen (27). The sharpness in footprint with  $\text{Rh}(\text{phi})_2(\text{bpy})^{3+}$  may then result from the fact that the rigid rhodium complex can occupy and cleave directly at all sites that are not obstructed by the DNA binding agent and cannot cleave directly or indirectly within the obstructed region since the reagent does not cleave through a diffusible intermediate and lacks a floppy appendage which itself contains the cleaving functionality. The footprint with  $\text{Rh}(\text{phi})_2(\text{bpy})^{3+}$  is, then, inherently "all or none", producing a high contrast image. The pattern of cleavage obtained would contrast that found with  $\text{Fe}(\text{EDTA})^{2-}$ , for example, which is mediated by hydroxyl radicals. With  $\text{Fe}(\text{EYta})^{2-}$  information has been obtained regarding subtle structural details associated with how domains within a DNA-binding protein associate with the helix rather than the edges of the protein binding site.  $\text{Rh}(\text{phi})_2(\text{bpy})^{3+}$  is not likely to be useful for such experiments. Instead the complex is extremely sensitive in sharply delineating the boundaries of a protein binding site with high contrast.

Another important aspect contributing to the versatility of  $\text{Rh}(\text{phi})_2(\text{bpy})^{3+}$  as a footprinting reagent is the fact that the complex appears to bind to helix by intercalation. Although a crystal structure is lacking on the phi complexes bound to oligonucleotides, helix unwinding results on a series of ruthenium complexes containing the phi ligand (28) as well as on  $\text{Rh}(\text{phi})_2(\text{bpy})^{3+}$  itself (29) indicate helix unwinding angles that are comparable to ethidium. Intercalative binding by a footprinting reagent increases the range of applicability for the reagent, since

intercalators can sense binding molecules in both the major and minor grooves. An intercalative interaction requires local helical unwinding and proteins bound to the one face of a helix clamp it shut against intercalation from the other side. Groove binding agents, in contrast, can sense only those molecules which bind in the same groove, unless binding to the other groove causes an appreciable structural alteration. Hydroxyl radical cleavage generated by  $\text{Fe(EDTA)}^{2-}$ , which does not bind to the helix itself, apparently reacts preferentially with minor groove protons, leading to a substantial weighing in footprints to those structural perturbations which occur in the minor groove. Since an intercalator can sense binding molecule in either groove, it becomes of secondary importance whether the intercalator itself binds from either the minor or major groove. Based upon analogy to other phi complexes of rhodium (III) as well as upon results with other metallointercalating agents, it is possible that this footprinting reagent is also unique in binding from the major groove (17,30). It should be noted in this context that the distamycin footprint with  $\text{Rh(phi)}_2(\text{bpy})^{3+}$  shows a single nucleotide shift to the 3' side in the protection pattern and no pattern asymmetry is clearly apparent in the EcoRI footprint. For the distamycin binding site, other footprinting reagents which appear to bind from the minor groove have shown 3'-shifts with a larger magnitude (2-3 nucleotides) (9,31).

Comparisons in footprinting of distamycin are made in Figure 9 between  $\text{Rh(phi)}_2(\text{bpy})^{3+}$  and other popular footprinting reagents,  $\text{MPE-Fe(II)}$ , DNase I and  $\text{Cu(phen)}_2^+$ . Comparative footprinting of EcoRI is shown in Figure 10, although  $\text{Cu(phen)}_2^+$  could not be included as it failed to footprint the protein in our hands (and also in the literature (22)). This result is not surprising given that the copper complex likely binds without intercalating in the minor groove.



DNase I footprints yield an exaggerated ligand site size, with distamycin and EcoRI, due to both the sequence selectivity and large size of the enzyme.  $\text{Cu(phen)}_2^+$  is a small reagent which could conceivably footprint distamycin to high resolution. However, as is apparent in Figure 7d,  $\text{Cu(phen)}_2^+$  lacks the necessary sequence neutrality.

The footprinting reagent most similar to  $\text{Rh(phi)}_2(\text{bpy})^{3+}$  in resolution and sequence-neutrality is MPE-Fe(II). As shown in Figures 9b and 10b, clear footprints of distamycin and EcoRI are obtained with this reagent. The sequence neutrality in reactions with MPE-Fe(II) may be somewhat higher than that with the rhodium complex. The footprinting pattern with MPE-Fe(II) is also of comparable resolution to that found with  $\text{Rh(phi)}_2(\text{bpy})^{3+}$  but may not be as sharp as is seen with the rhodium complex, likely because the reaction is mediated by a diffusible species. Another notable difference between  $\text{Rh(phi)}_2(\text{bpy})^{3+}$  and MPE-Fe(II) is that the latter shows a greater propensity to detect weak distamycin binding sites at comparable concentrations. This is probably a result of the lower binding constant of MPE-Fe(II) to DNA [ $1.5 \times 10^5 \text{ M}^{-1}$  for MPE-Ni(II)] (9). One can derive the binding constant for  $\text{Rh(phi)}_2(\text{bpy})^{3+}$  to the distamycin binding site by using a kinetic treatment such as that applied to ligand binding in the presence of a competitive inhibitor (32), and such an analysis yields an apparent  $\text{Rh(phi)}_2(\text{bpy})^{3+}$  binding constant to the  $A_6$  site of  $10^6$ - $10^7 \text{ M}^{-1}$ . This calculation is also consistent with the observation that DNA (5  $\mu\text{M}$  bp) can be efficiently cleaved by  $\text{Rh(phi)}_2(\text{bpy})^{3+}$  at concentrations of 50 nM. Taken together, the binding data indicate that  $\text{Rh(phi)}_2(\text{bpy})^{3+}$  has a higher association constant than MPE-Fe(II) to B-DNA.

Besides the quality of its footprints, an important practical advantage in using  $\text{Rh(phi)}_2(\text{bpy})^{3+}$  for footprinting is simply its ease and range of handling. The complex is

stable indefinitely in the solid state or stored as a frozen aqueous solution. It is not inhibited by moderate concentrations of divalent cations, EDTA, reducing agents, or glycerol. No complicated procedures or highly reactive species are required for the cleavage reaction, and clear  
5 footprinting may be obtained over a wide range of ligand and  $\text{Rh}(\text{phi})_2(\text{bpy})^{3+}$  concentrations. These characteristics contrast  $\text{Rh}(\text{phi})_2(\text{bph})^{3+}$  with reagents that require chemical activation such as  $\text{Cu}(\text{phen})_2^+$  and  $\text{MPE-Fe(II)}$ .

10 In summary, photoactivated cleavage with  $\text{Rh}(\text{phi})_2(\text{bpy})^{3+}$  permits high sensitivity, clear resolution, wide applicability and excellent control in footprinting experiments of DNA-binding molecules. Since  $\text{Rh}(\text{phi})_2(\text{bpy})^{3+}$  can be used with common UV light sources, the requirement  
15 for photolysis should be an advantage rather than an inconvenience. Perhaps most importantly, photofootprinting reagents such as  $\text{Rh}(\text{phi})_2(\text{bpy})^{3+}$  may lend themselves especially well to footprinting DNA-bound proteins within living cells.

20 It appears then that luminescence is observed only when the ruthenium complex is intercalated in (or perhaps otherwise protected by) the nucleic acid structure. Similarly when  $\text{Ru}(\text{bpy})_2(\text{dppz})^{2+}$  ( $10 \mu\text{M}$ ) was mixed with  $100 \mu\text{M}$  poly  $r(\text{AU}) \cdot r(\text{AU})$  (buffer R) no luminescence ( $\lambda_{\text{irr}} = 482 \text{ nm}$ ) was  
25 observed under conditions. This result is consistent with the absence of intercalation we found of ruthenium complexes with A-form RNA<sup>(43)</sup>. This demonstrates that the complex is very specific in the helical DNA it will bind. The relative  
30 luminescence of ruthenium complexes in the presence of various helical DNA's under varying conditions is shown in Table 16.

35 In conclusion a new luminescent probe for the various structures of DNA has been developed. It has been observed

that  $\text{aRu}(\text{bpy})_2(\text{dppz})^{2+}$  binds to both B and Z-form DNA that this complex displays different luminescence in the absence of DNA. The polarization experiments describe that the complex not only intercalates into the Z-form but is also held more rigidly by Z-form than by the analogous B-form.

5 In both forms of DNA the complex is bound in a ration of 1:10 metal complex:base pairs.

One interesting application is the binding of this complex to DNA that has been electrophoresed in a agarose gel. In

10 side-by-side studies,  $\text{Ru}(\text{bpy})_2(\text{dppz})^{2+}$  and ethidium were found to stain DNA imbedded in the agarose gels through luminescence upon illumination from below. This complex has an advantage over the conventional ethidium-bromide stain in that there is no background luminescence from the complex

15 bound to agarose, therefore, destaining is not required ever<sup>(44)</sup>.

$\text{Ru}(\text{phen})_2(\text{dppz})^{2+}$ , and  $\text{Ru}(\text{dip})_2(\text{dppz})^{2+}$  seem have similar behavior as described above. In preliminary studies these

20 complexes have been shown to luminesce only in the presence of DNA but not in the presence of  $\text{H}_2\text{O}$  (or Buffer) alone<sup>(44)</sup>. We are presently tethering this complexes,  $\text{Ru}(\text{bpy})_2(\text{dppz})^{2+}$ ,  $\text{Ru}(\text{dppz})_2\text{phen}^{2+}$ , and  $\text{Ru}(\text{phen})_2(\text{dppz})^{2+}$  to oligonucleotides to develop non-radioactive luminescent DNA probes for both

25 heterogeneous and homogeneous assay systems. The probes, constructed in this way should luminesce only upon finding its target sequence.

Table 16

5                   The Relative Luminescence of  $\text{Ru}(\text{bpy})_3(\text{dppz})_2^{2+}(\ast)$   
in Various Solvents and in the presence of DNA

	Solvent	DNA	Temp	Rel. Lumi.
10	$\text{H}_2\text{O}$	---	25	---
	Buffer(**)	---	25	---
	$\text{CH}_3\text{OH}$	---	250	0.23
	iso-propanol	---	25	1.00
	iso-propanol	---	75	0.81
15	Buffer**	CT DNA	25	0.61
	Buffer**	CT DNA	35	0.06
	Buffer**	CT DNA	45	0.59
	Buffer**	CT DNA	55	0.55
	Buffer**	CT DNA	70	0.47
20	Buffer**	CT DNA	90	0.23
	Buffer	CT DNA	25	0.55
	Buffer	CT DNA	75	0.53
	Buffer	poly d(GC)·d(GC)	25	0.72
	Buffer	poly d(AT)·d(AT)	25	0.68
25	Buffer	poly r(AU)·r(AU)	25	0.01

\*  $\text{Ru}(\text{bpy})_2(\text{dppz})_2^{2+}$  10  $\mu\text{M}$

Buffer\*\* 0.5 mM NaCl, 0.05 mM Tris-OH, pH = 7.0

30 Buffer 50.0 mM NaCl, 5.0 mM Tris-OH, pH = 7.0

REFERENCES

1. Galas, D.J. and Schmitz, A. (1978) Nucl. Acids Res. 5, 3157-3170.
- 5 2. Dervan, P.B. (1986) Science 232, 464-471.
3. Tullius, T.D. (1987) Trends Biochem. Sci. 12, 297-300.
- 10 4. Sigman, D.S. (1986) Accts. Chem. Res. 19, 180-186.
5. Van Dyke, M.W., Roeder, R.G. and Sawadogo, M. (1988) Science 241, 1335-1338. Kownin, P., Bateman, E. and Paule, M.R. (1987) Cell 50, 693-699.
- 15 6. Drew, H.R. and Travers, A.A. (1984) Cell 37, 491-502. Suggs, J.W. and Wagner, R.W. (1986) Nucl. Acids Res. 14, 3703-3716. Suck, D., Lahm, A. and Oefner, C. (1988) Nature 332, 464-468.
- 20 7. Jessee, B., Gargiulo, G., Razvi, F. and Worcel, A. (1982) Nucl. Acids Res. 10, 5823-5834. Veal, J.M. and Rill, R.L. (1989) Biochemistry 28, 3243-3250. Veal, J. M. and Rill, R.L. (1988) Biochemistry 27, 1822-1827. Kobashi, K. (1968) Biochim. Biophys. Acta 158, 239-245.
- 25 8. Yoon, C., Kuwabara, M.D., Law, R., Wall, R. and Sigman, D.S. (1988) J. Biol. Chem. 263, 8458-8463.
- 30 8. Ward, B., Skorobogaty, A. and Dabrowiak, J.C. (1986) Biochemistry 25, 6875-6883. Ward, B., Skorobogaty, A. and Dabrowiak, J.C. (1986) Biochemistry 25, 7827-7833. Dabrowiak, J.C., Ward, B. and Goodisman, J. (1989) Biochemistry 28, 3314-3322. Ward, B., Rehfuss, R., Goodisman, J. and Darbowski, J.C. (1988) Biochemistry 27, 1198-1205.
- 35

9. Van Dyke, M.W., Hertzberg, R.P. and Dervan, P.B. (1982) Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA 79, 5470-5474. Hertzberg, R.R. and Dervan, P.B. (1982) J. Am. Chem. Soc. 104, 313-315. Hertzberg, R.P. and Dervan, P.B. (1984) Biochemistry 23, 3934-3945.
- 5
10. Van Dyke, M.W. and Dervan, P.B. (1983) Nucl. Acids Res. 11, 5555-5567.
11. Hurley, L.H., Lee, C.-S., McGovren, J.P., Warpehoski, M.A., Mitchell, M.A., Kelly, R.C. and Aristoff, P.A. (1988) Biochemistry 27, 3886-3892.
- 10
12. Cartwright, I.L. and Elgin, S.C.R. (1986) Mol. Cell. Biol. 6, 779-791. Gunderson, S.I., Chapman, K. A. and Burgess, R.R. (1987) Biochemistry 26, 1539-1546. Pruijn, G.J.M., van Miltenburg, R.T., Claessens, J.A.J. and van der Vliet, P.C. (1988) J. Virology 62, 3092-3102.
- 15
13. Tullius, T.D., Dombrowski, B.A., Churchill, M.E.A. and Kam, L. (1987) Methods in Enzymology 155, 537-558. Tullius, T.D. and Dombrowski, B.A. (1986) Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA 83, 5469-5473.
- 20
14. Becker, M.M., and Wang, J.C. (1984) Nature 309, 682-687. Becker, M.M., Lesser, D., Kurpiewski, M., Baranger, A. and Jen-Jacobson, L. (1988) Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA 85, 6247-6251. Selleck, S.B. and Majors J. (1988) Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA 85, 5399-5403. Wang, Z., and Becker, M.M. (1988) Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA 85, 654-658.
- 25
- 30
15. Nielsen, P.E., Jeppesen, C. and Buchardt, O. (1988) FEBS Lett. 235, 122-124. Jeppesen, C. and Nielsen, P.E. (1989) Nucl. Acids Res. 17, 4947.
- 35

16. Jeppesen, C., Buchardt, O., Henriksen, U., and Nielsen, P.E. (1988) FEBS Lett. 229, 73-76.
17. Pyle, A.M., Long, E.C. and Barton, J.K. (1989) J. Am. Chem. Soc. 111, 4520-4522.
18. Fox, K.R. (1988) Biochem. Biophys. Res. comm. 155, 779-785.
19. Maniatis, T., Fritsch, E.F. and Sambrook, J. (1982) Molecular Cloning, a Laboratory Manual, Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory, Cold Spring Harbor, N.Y.
20. Luck, G., Zimmer, C., Reinert, K.-E., and Arcamone, F. (1977) Nucl. Acids Res. 4, 2655-2670.
21. Modrich, P., and Zabel, D. (1976) J. Biol. Chem. 251, 5866-5874.
22. Fox, K.R. and Waring, M.J. (1984) Nucl. Acids Res. 12, 9271-9285. Spassky, A, and Sigman, D.S. (1985) Biochemistry 24, 8050-8056. Kuwabara, M., Yoon, C., Goyne, T., Thederahn, T., and Sigman, D.S. (1986) Biochemistry 25, 7401-7408.
23. Maxam, A. and Gilbert, W. (1980) Methods in Enzymology 65, 499-560.
24. Coll, M., Frederick, C.A., Wang, A. H.-J., Rich, A. (1987) Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA 84, 8385-8389. Kopka, M.L., Yoon, C., Goodsell, D., Pjura, P. and Dickerson, R.E. (1985) J. Mol. Biol. 183, 553-563.
25. Frederick, C.A., Grable, J., Melia, M., Samudzi, C., Jen-Jacobson, L., Wang, B.-C., Greene, P., Boyer, H.W.

- Rosenberg, J.M. (1984) Nature 309, 327-331. McClarin, J.A., Frederick, C.A., Wang, B.-C., Greene, P., Boyer, H.W., Grable J., and Rosenberg, J.M. (1986) Science 234, 1526-1541.
- 5 26. Sluka, J.P. Horvath, S.J., Bruist, M.F., Simon M.I. and Dervan, P.B. (1987) Science 238, 1129-1132.
27. Mei, H.-Y. and Barton, J.K. (1988) Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA 85, 1339-1343.
- 10 28. Pyle, A.M., Rehmann, J.P., Meshoyrer, R., Kumar, C.V., Turro, N.J. and Barton, J.K. (1989) J. Am. Chem. Soc. 111, 3051-3058.
- 15 29. Pyle, A.M. (1989) Ph.D Dissertation, Columbia University.
30. It appears that, in general, metallointercalatio reagents associate from the major groove of the DNA helix. For an example, see: Wang, A.H.-J., Nathans, J., van der Marel, B., van Boom, J.H., Rich, A. (1978) Nature 276, 471-474.
- 20 31. Protugal, J., & Waring, M.J. (1987) FEBS Lett. 225, 195-200. Van Dyke, M.W., Hertzberg, R.P. and Dervan, P.B. (1982) Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA 79, 5470-5474. Harshman, K.D. and Dervan, P.B. (1985) Nucl. Acids Res. 13, 4825-4835.
- 30 32. Given that the  $K_b$  of distamycin to the  $T_6$  footprinting site is  $-10^{7-8} M^{-1}$  (Zimmer, C. and Waehnert, U. (1986) Prog. Biophys. Molec. Biol. 47, 31-112) and given the concentrations of the rhodium complex and distamycin used in the experiment, one can apply a binding model similar to that of enzyme kinetics employed in the
- 35



presence of a kinetic inhibitor (Segal, I.H. (1975) Enzyme Kinetics: Behavior and Analysis of Rapid Equilibrium and Steady State Enzyme Systems, Wiley Interscience, New York.)

- 5 33. Juris, A.; Balzani, V.; Barigelletti, F.; Campagna, S. Belser, P.; and Von Zelewsky A. Coord. Chem. Revs. 84, 1988, 85.
- 10 34. Gillard, R.D.; Hill, R.E.E. J. Chem Soc., Dalton Trans. 1974, 1217.
35. Demas, J.N.; Crosby, G.A. J. Amr. Chem. Soc. 93, 1971, 2841.
- 15 36. Kumar, C.V.; Barton, J.K.; Turro, N.J. J. Amer. Chem. Soc. 107, 1985, 5518.
37. Friedman, A.E. Kumar, C.V.; Turro, N.J.; Barton, J.K. Manuscript in preparation.
- 20 38. We thank J.-C. Chambron for the gift of  $\text{Ru}(\text{bpy})_2(\text{dppz})^{2+}$
39. Chambron, J.-C.; Sauvage, J.-P.; Amouyal, E.; Koffi, P. Neuv. J. De Chimie. 9. 1985, 527.
- 25 40. Buffer R + 50.0 mM NaCl, 5.0 mM Tris-OH, pH + 7.0
41. Buffer R-L + 20.0 mM NaCl, 2.0 mM Tris-OH, pH = 7.0, 4  $\mu\text{M}$   $\text{Co}(\text{NH}_3)_6^{3+}$ .
- 30 42. Pohl, F.M.; Jovin, T.M.; Baehr, W.; Holbrook, J.J., 1972, Proc.Natl. Acad. Sci. USA, 69, 3805-9.
43. Mei, H.-Y.; Barton, J.K., 1988, Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA, 85, 1339-43.
- 35

44. Friedman, A.E.; Jaycox, G.D.; Barton, J.K. Manuscript in preparation.
45. Sutin, N; Creutz, C., Pure Appl. Chem., 1980, 52, 2717.
46. Kalyasundaram, K., Coord. Chem. Rev., 1982, 46, 159.
47. Meyer, T.J., Pure Appl. Chem., 1986, 58, 1193.
48. Ghosh, P.K; Bard, A.J., J. Phys. Chem., 1984, 88, 5519.  
Krenske, D.; Abto, S.; Van Damme, H.; Cruz, M.; Fripiat, J.J., J. Phys. Chem., 1980, 84, 2447.
49. Kumar, C.V.; Barton, J.K.; Turro, N.J., J. Am. Soc., 1985, 107, 5518; Barton, J.K., Science (Washington, D.C.) 1986, 233, 727.
50. Juris A.; Barigelletti, F.; Balzani, V.; Belser, P.; von Zelewsky, A., Isr. J. Chem. 1982, 22, 87.
51. Belser, P.; von Zelewsky, A.; Zehnder, M., Inorg. Chem., 1981, 20, 3098.
52. Warren, L. Inorg. Chem., 1977, 16, 2814.
53. Tome Dieck, H.; Reick, I., Angew. Chem., int. Ed. Engl. 1970, 9, 793.
54. Schlosser, v. K.Z., Chem., 1970, 10, 439.
55. Tuchtenhagen, G.; Ruhlmann, K., Justus Liebigs Ann. Chem., 1968, 711, 174.
56. Schlosser, v. K.Z., Anorg. Allg. Chem., 1972, 387, 91.

57. Blue ruthenium species are produced in great quantity if the reaction is allowed to reflux too long or if concentrated solutions of  $\text{Ru}(\text{phi})_3^{2+}$  are allowed to stand for long periods of time. Chromatography has shown these species to be variable and high in molecular weight. Deep blue ruthenium species have been observed previously and formulated either as clusters or ligand-bridged multinuclear species.<sup>14</sup>
58. rose, D.; Wilkinson, G., J. Chem. Soc. A, 1970, 1791.
59. Curtis, J.; Sullivan, B. P. Meyer, T.J., Inorg. Chem., 1983, 22, 224.
60. Gutman, V., The Donor-Acceptor Approach to Molecular Interactions, Plenum: New York, 1978.
61. The additional intense band at 510 nm leads to the purple coloration in the complex. A comparable pair of low-energy transitions are found in the benzoquinone dimine derivative.
62. Ackerman, M.N.; Interrante, L.V., Inorg. Chem., 1984, 23, 3904.
63. Mabrouk, P.A.; Wrighton, M.S., Inorg. Chem., 1986, 25, 526. Dumar, C.V.; Gould, I.S.; Barton, J.K.; Turro, N.J., submitted for publication.
64. It is interesting that the transition centered at 510 nm in  $\text{Ru}(\text{phi})_3^{2+}$  is not at all apparent in mixed-ligand complexes containing the phi ligand. Instead, the 525-nm transition in  $\text{Ru}(\text{bpy})_2(\text{phi})^{2+}$  species. The visible spectrum of  $\text{Ru}(\text{bpy})(\text{phi})_2^{2+}$  (data not shown) shows visible transitions centered at 472 and 572 nm, consistent with some degree of delocalization.

65. A similar delocalization may explain the intense visible transition in the ruthenium cage complex recently prepared by Sargeson, et al. (personal communication).
- 5
66. Barton, J.K., Science 1986, 233, 727.
67. Dervan, P.B., Science 1986, 232, 464; Wade, W.S.; Dervan, P.B. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 1987 109, 1574.
- 10
68. Berman, H.M.; Young, P.R. Ann. Rev. Biophys. Bioeng. 1981 10, 87.
69. Waring, M.J.; Fox, K.R.; Grigg, G.W. Biochem. J. 1987 15 143, 847; burchardt, G.; Waehnert, U.; Luck, G.; Zimmer, C. Stud. Biophys. 1986 114, 225; Kissinger, K. Krowicki, K., Dabrowiak, J.C., Lown, J.W. Biochemistry 1987 26, 5590.
- 20 70. Quigley, G.J.; Ughetto, G.; van der Marel, G.; van Boom, J.H.; Wang, A.H.-J.; Rich, A. Science 1986 232, 1255; Kopka, M.L.; Yoon, C.; Goodsell, D.; Pjura, P.; Dickerson, R.E. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A. 1985 82, 1376; Pjura, P.W.; Grezeskowiak, K.; Dickerson, R.E. J. Mol. biol. 1987 197, 257.
- 25
71. Wilson, W.D.; Wang, Y-H.; Kusuma, S.; Chandrasekaran, S.; Yang, N.C.; Boykin, D.W.J. Am. Chem. Soc. 1985, 107, 4989-4995.
- 30
72. Breslauer, K.J., Remata, D.P.; Chou, W.Y.; Ferrante, R.; Curry, J.; Zaunczkowski, D.; Snyder, J.G.; Marky, L.A. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A. 1987 84, 8922; Ibanez, V.; Geacintov, N.E.; Gagliano, A.G.;
- 35

- Brondimarte, S.; Harvey, R.G. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 1980, 102, 5661.
73. Kumar, C.V.; Barton, J.K.; Turro, N.J. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 1985, 107, 5518.
- 5 74. Barton, J.K.; Goldberg, J.M.; Kumar, C.V.; Turro, N.J. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 1986, 108, 2081; J. Rehmann, Ph.D. Dissertation, Columbia University.
- 10 75. Mei, H.-Y.; Barton J.K.; Raphael, A.L. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A. 1985, 82, 6460.
76. Kirshenbaum, M.R.; Tribolet, R.; Barton, J.K. Nucl. Acids Res. 1988, 16, 7943.
- 15 77. Meyer, T.J. Pure and Appl. Chem. 1986 58, 1193; Sutin, N. and Creutz, C. Pure Appl. Chem. 1980 52, 2717.
- 20 78. Belser, P.; von Zelewsky, A. Zehnder, M. Inorg. Chem. 1981 20, 3098.
79. Pyle, A.M.; Barton, J.K. Inorg. Chem. 1987 26, 3820.
80. Krause, R.A. Inorg. Chem. Acta 1977 22, 209.
- 25 81. Lin, C.-T.; Botcher, W.; Chou, M.; Creutz, C.; Sutin, N.J. Am. Chem. Soc. 1976 98, 6536.
82. Henderson, L.J.; Fronczek, F.R.; Cherry, W.R. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 1984 106, 5876.
- 30 83. Mass spectral data are reported as mass/ion values, rather than mass/charge ratios.

84. Kumar, C.V.; Barton, J.K.; Turro, N.J. Inorg. Chem. 1987 26, 1455.
- 5 85. Dallinger, R.F.; Woodruff, W.H. J. am. Chem. Soc. 1979 101 4391; Bradley, P.G.; Kress, N.; Hornberger, B.A.; Dallinger, R.; Woodruff, W.H. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 1981 103 7441. Smothers, W.K.; Weighton, M.S. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 1983 105, 1067.
- 10 86. Keller, W. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A. 1975 72, 4876.
87. Wang, J.C. J. Mol. Biol. 1974 89, 783.
88. Scatchard, G. Ann. NY. Acad. Sci. 1949 51, 660.
- 15 89. McGheem J.D.; von Hippel, P.H. J. Mol. Biol. 1974 86, 469.
90. Mason, S.F.; Peart, B.J. Chem. Soc. Dalton Trans. 1973, 949.
- 20 91. Bloomfield, V.A.; Crothers, D.M.; Trinoco, Jr., I. Physical Chemistry of Nucleic Acids, Harper and Row, New York 1974, p. 432.
- 25 92. Wolfe, A.; Chimer, G.H.; Meehan, T. Biochem. 1987 26, 6392.
93. Waring, M.J. J. Mol. Biol. 1970 54, 247.
- 30 94. The unwinding angle for  $\text{Ru}(\text{phen})_3^{2+}$  has been measured by others as well and compares favorably with our determination. See Kelly, J.M.; Tossi, A.B.; McConell, D.J.; OhVigin, C. Nucl. Acids. Res. 1985 13, 6017.

95. Kumar, C.V.; Barton, J.K.; Gould, I.R.; Turro, N.J.;  
Van Hooten, J. Inorg. Chem. 1988, 27, 648.

5 96. These results taken together provide strong evidence in  
support of intercalation, but only a crystal structure  
of the complex bound to the oligonucleotide may be  
considered definitive.

10 97. Although much can be inferred about the binding mode of  
the complex from these spectroscopic results, no  
conclusions may be drawn concerning similarities in  
where the complexes bind on the helix, either with  
respect to sequence to groove location.

15 98. Goldstein, B.M.; Barton, J.K.; Berman, H.M. Inorg.  
Chem. 1986 25, 842.

20 99. The fact that a lower concentration of  $\text{Ru}(\text{phi})_2\text{bpy}^{2+}$  is  
needed for 50% helix unwinding compared to  $\text{Ru}(\text{bpy})_2\text{phi}^{2+}$   
may be consistent with this idea.

25 100. Consistent with this idea, both  $\text{Ru}(\text{DIP})_3^{2+}$  appear to  
bind DNA more avidly than their mixed ligand analogs,  
though their poor solubility makes the quantitative  
comparison difficult.

30 101. The calculations of solvent accessible surface area  
were performed using water as the probe molecule  
(radius of 1.58 Å) using the program Macromodel,  
written by W.C. Still, Columbia University.

What is claimed is:

1. A coordination complex or salt thereof which is spectroscopically or photoactively determinable when bound to DNA

5  
10  
15  
20  
25  
30  
35

having the formula  $R_1-M-R_3$ , wherein M is a suitable transition metal and each of  $R_1$ ,  $R_2$  and  $R_3$  is ethylenediamine or a substituted derivative thereof, bipyridine or a substituted derivative thereof, phenanthroline or a substituted derivative thereof, diazafluorene-9-one or a substituted derivative thereof, phenanthrenequinonediimine or a substituted derivative thereof, dipyridophenazine or a substituted derivative thereof; wherein  $R_1$ ,  $R_2$  and  $R_3$  are bound to M by coordination bonds and wherein  $R_1$  and  $R_2$  may be the same or different, but if the same are different from  $R_3$ .

2. A complex of claim 1, wherein M is Ru, Rh, Co, Fe, Cr, Cu, Zn, Cd, or Pb.

3. A complex of claim 2, wherein M is Ru, Rh, or Co.

4. A complex of claim 1, wherein bipyridine is 2,2'-bipyridine (bpy), phenanthroline is 1,10-phenanthroline (phen), diazafluorene-9-one is 4,5-diazafluorene-9-one (flone), phenanthrenequinonediimine is 9,10-phenanthrenequinonediimine (phi) and , dipyridophenazine is 3,2-dypridophenazine (dppz).

5. A complex of claim 4, wherein the substituted derivative of phenanthroline comprises 4,7-diamino-1,10-phenanthroline; 3,8-diamino-1,10-phenanthroline; 4,7-diethylenediamine-1,10-phenanthroline; 3,8-diethylenediamine-1,10-phenanthroline; 4,7-dihydroxyl-



1,10-phenanthroline; 3,8-dihydroxyl-1,10-phenanthroline;  
4,7-dinitro-1,10-phenanthroline; 3,8-dinitro-1,10-  
phenanthroline; 4,7-diphenyl-1,10-phenanthroline (DIP);  
3,8-diphenyl-1,10-phenanthroline; 4,7-dispermine-1,10-  
phenanthroline; 3,8-dispermine-1,10-phenanthroline; 5-  
5 nitro-phenanthroline (5-NO<sub>2</sub>phen); or 3,4,7,8-tetramethyl-  
phenanthroline (TMP) and wherein the substituted  
derivative of bipyridine comprises 4,4' diphenyl  
bipyridine; bis 4,4' methyl bipyridylate or bis 4,4'  
bipyridylamide.

10

6. A complex of claim 1, wherein R<sub>1</sub> and R<sub>2</sub> are the same.

7. A complex of claim 6 having the formula M(phen)<sub>2</sub>(phi),  
M(bpy)<sub>2</sub>(phi), M(phi)<sub>2</sub>(bpy), M(phi)<sub>2</sub>(4,4'diphenyl  
bipyridine), M(bis 4,4'methyl bipyridylate)<sub>2</sub>(phi), M(bis  
4,4'bipyridylamide)<sub>2</sub>(phi), M(bpy)<sub>2</sub>(phen), M(phen)<sub>2</sub>(bpy),  
M(phen)<sub>2</sub>(flone), M(bpy)<sub>2</sub>(DIP), M(bpy)<sub>2</sub>(DIP),  
M(phen)<sub>2</sub>(DIP), or M(DIP)<sub>2</sub>(phen), M(bpy)<sub>2</sub>(dppz),  
M(phen)<sub>2</sub>(dppz), M(DIP)<sub>2</sub>(dppz), or M(dppz)<sub>2</sub>(phen).

15  
20

8. A complex of claim 7, wherein M is Ru, Rh, or Co.

9. A complex of claim 8, wherein M is Ru.

10. A complex of claim 8, wherein M is Rh.

11. A complex of claim 3 having the formula  
M(ethylenediamine)<sub>2</sub>(phi).

12. A complex of claim 9 having the formula  
Ru(bpy)<sub>2</sub>(phen)<sup>2+</sup>.

13. A complex of claim 9 having the formula  
Ru(phen)<sub>2</sub>(bpy)<sup>2+</sup>.

35

14. A complex of claim 9 having the formula  $\text{Ru}(\text{phen})_2(\text{flone})^{2+}$ .
15. A complex of claim 9 having the formula  $\text{Ru}(\text{bpy})_2(\text{DIP})^{2+}$ .
- 5 16. A complex of claim 9 having the formula  $\text{Ru}(\text{phen})_2(\text{DIP})^{2+}$ .
17. A complex of claim 9 having the formula  $\text{Ru}(\text{DIP})_2(\text{phen})^{2+}$ .
- 10 18. A complex of claim 9 having the formula  $\text{Ru}(\text{phi})_2(\text{bpy})^{2+}$ .
19. A complex of claim 9 having the formula  $\text{Ru}(\text{phen})_2(\text{phi})^{2+}$ .
- 15 20. A complex of claim 9 having the formula  $\text{Ru}(\text{bpy})_2(\text{phi})^{2+}$ .
21. A complex of claim 10 having the formula  $\text{Rh}(\text{phi})_2(\text{bpy})^{3+}$ .
22. A complex of claim 10 having the formula  $\text{Rh}(\text{phen})_2(\text{phi})^{3+}$ .
- 25 23. A complex of claim 10 having the formula  $\text{Rh}(\text{phi})_2(4,4'$   
diphenyl bipyridine) $^{3+}$ .
24. A complex of claim 10 having the formula  $\text{Rh}(\text{bis } 4,4'$   
methyl bipyridylate) $_2(\text{phi})^{3+}$ .
- 30 25. A complex of claim 10 having the formula  $\text{Rh}(\text{bis } 4,4'$   
bipyridylamide) $_2(\text{phi})^{3+}$ .

26. A coordination complex or salt thereof which is spectroscopically or photoactively determinable when bound to DNA

5 having the formula  $R_1-M-R_3$ , wherein M is a suitable transition metal and each of  $R_1$ ,  $R_2$  and  $R_3$  is ethylenediamine or a substituted derivative thereof, bipyridine or a substituted derivative thereof, phenanthroline or a substituted derivative thereof, 10 diazafluorene-9-one or a substituted derivative thereof, or phenanthrenequinonediimine or a substituted derivative thereof; wherein  $R_1$ ,  $R_2$  and  $R_3$  are bound to M by coordination bonds; provided that at least one of  $R_1$ ,  $R_2$  or  $R_3$  is dipyridophenazine or a substituted derivative thereof. 15

27. A complex of claim 26, wherein M is Ru.

20 28. A complex of claim 27 having the formula  $Ru(phen)_2(dppz)^{2+}$ .

29. A complex of claim 27 having the formula  $Ru(bpy)_2(dppz)^{2+}$ .

25 30. A complex of claim 27 having the formula  $Ru(DIP)_2(dppz)^{2+}$ .

30 31. A complex of claim 27 having the formula  $Ru(dppz)_2(phen)^{2+}$ .

32. A complex of claim 27 having the formula  $Ru(dppz)_2(bpy)^{2+}$ .

33. A coordination complex or salt thereof which is spectroscopically or photoactively determinable

5 when bound to DNA having the formula  $\begin{array}{c} R \\ | \\ R-M-R \end{array}$ , wherein M is Ru or Rh and R is 9-10, phenanthrenequinonediimine, 5-nitro-phenanthroline or 3,2-dipyridophanazine or a substituted thereof.

- 10 34. The optically resolved delta isomer of the complex of claim 1, 8, 26, or 33

35. The optically resolved lambda isomer of the complex of claim 1, 8, 26, or 33

- 15 36. A method for labeling DNA with a complex which is determinable spectroscopically or photoactively when bound to the DNA which comprises contacting the DNA with the complex of claim 1, 8, 11, 26, or 33 conditions such that the complex binds to the DNA and  
20 thereby labels the DNA with the complex.

37. A labeled DNA molecule comprising a DNA molecule and the complex of claim 1.

- 25 38. A labeled DNA molecule comprising a DNA molecule and the complex of claim 8.

39. A labeled DNA molecule comprising a DNA molecule and the complex of claim 11.

- 30 40. A labeled DNA molecule comprising a DNA molecule and the complex of claim 26.

41. A labeled DNA molecule comprising a DNA molecule and the complex of claim 33.
- 5 42. A method for selectively labeling a conformation present in a double stranded DNA comprising the conformation which comprises contacting the DNA with the complex or an isomer of the complex of claim 1, 8, 11, 26, or 33 so that the complex or the isomer binds to the conformation thereby labeling the conformation.
- 10 43. A method of claim 42, wherein the conformation is Z-DNA, A-DNA, B-DNA, or a cruciform of DNA.
- 15 44. A method for detecting the presence of a conformation present in double-stranded DNA which comprises selectively labeling the conformation according to claim 42 and detecting the presence of the complex or the isomer of the complex bound to the conformation.
- 20 45. A method of claim 44, wherein the conformation is Z-DNA, A-DNA, B-DNA, or a cruciform of DNA.
- 25 46. A labeled DNA probe which comprises the complex of claim 1 covalently bound to the DNA probe.
47. A labeled DNA probe which comprises the complex of claim 26 covalently bound to the DNA probe.
- 30 48. A method of detecting the presence in a sample a target DNA of interest which comprises contacting the sample containing the target DNA with a complementary labeled DNA probe of any of claims 45 or 46 under hybridizing conditions and measuring the resulting luminescence emitted from the labeled DNA probe, a change in the luminescence as compared with the luminescence in the
- 35

absence of the sample indicating the presence of the target DNA.

- 5 49. A method of claim 48 wherein the complex of claim 26 is a complex of claim 28, 29, 30, 31, or 32.
50. A method of claim 48, wherein the target DNA is quenched with a dipyridphenazine ligand of the complex of claim 26.
- 10 51. A method for nicking double-stranded DNA by effecting breakage of at least one phosphodiester bond along the DNA which comprises contacting the DNA with the coordinatin complex of claim 1, 8, 11, 26 or 33 under conditions such that the complex binds to the DNA to
- 15 form an adduct and irradiating the adduct so formed with visible light or ultraviolet radiation of an appropriate wavelength which is absorbed by the complex so as to nick the DNA at the site of binding.
- 20 52. A method for cleaving double-stranded DNA which comprises nicking the DNA according to claim 51 and treating the nicked DNA so produced with an enzyme which is not deactivated in the presence of the complex used for nicking the DNA and is capable of cleaving
- 25 single-stranded DNA so as to cleave the nicked DNA at the site of the nick.
53. A method according to claim 51, wherein the nicking is performed in vivo.
- 30 54. A method according to claim 51, wherein the cleaving is performed in vivo.
55. A method for selectively nicking DNA at a conformation
- 35 present in the DNA by effecting breakage of at least

one phosphodiester bond which comprises contacting the DNA containing the conformation with the complex or an isomer of the complex of claim 1, 8, 11, 26 or 33 under conditions such that the complex or the isomer binds to the DNA at the conformation to form an adduct and  
5 irradiating the adduct so formed with visible light or ultraviolet radiation of an appropriate wavelength which is absorbed by the complex or the isomer so as to nick the DNA at the site of binding.

10 56. A method for selectively cleaving double-stranded DNA at a conformation which comprises nicking the DNA according to claim 55 and treating the nicked DNA so produced with an enzyme which is not deactivated in the presence of the complex used for nicking the DNA and  
15 is capable of cleaving single-stranded DNA so as to cleave the nicked DNA at the site of the nick.

57. A method according to claim 55, wherein the nicking is performed in vivo.

20 58. A method according to claim 56, wherei the cleaving is performed in vivo.

59. A method for footprinting a labeled DNA fragment with comprising binding the complex of claim 1, 8, 10, 26 or  
25 33 to the labeled DNA fragment and irradiating the complex with so as to cleave the labeled DNA at the site of binding of the complex to the labeled DNA fragment to produce a footprint of the binding site.

30 60. A method of claim 59, wherein the binding of the complex comprises intercalation.

61. A method of claim 59, wherein the binding occurs in  
35 major and minor gooves of the DNA.

62. A method of claim 59, wherein the complex is  $\text{Rh}(\phi)_2(\text{bpy})^{3+}$
- 5 63. A method for killing a portion of a population of appropriate tumor cells which comprises contacting the tumor cells under suitable conditions with an effective amount of the coordination complex of claim 1, 8, 11, 13, 26 or 33 so as to kill the tumor cells.
- 10 64. A method of claim 63, wherein the tumor cells are present in a subject and the contacting is effected by administering the coordination complex to the subject.
- 15 65. A method of claim 63, which further comprises irradiating the tumor cells with visible light or ultraviolet radiation of an appropriate wavelength at a suitable time after the tumor cells have been contacted with the complex.
- 20 66. A pharmaceutical composition for the treatment of tumor cells in a subject which comprises an effective anti-tumor amount of the complex of claim 1, 8, 11, 26 or 43 and a pharmaceutically acceptable carrier.
- 25 67. A method for treating a subject afflicted with tumor cells so as to cause regression of the tumor cells which comprises administering to the subject by a suitable route a composition of claim 66 in an amount sufficient to cause regression of the tumor cells.
- 30 68. A method of claim 67, wherein the route of administration is parenteral or orally.
- 35 69. A method of claim 67, wherein the route of administration is topical.



70. A method of treating a subject infected by human immunodeficiency virus which comprises administering to the subject an amount of the complex Rh(DIP)<sub>3</sub> effective to inhibit the activity of the virus.

5

71. A method of claim 70 where the administering is effected orally or parenterally.

10

72. A pharmaceutical composition which comprises an amount of the complex Rh(DIP)<sub>3</sub> effective to inhibit the activity of human immunodeficiency virus and a pharmaceutically acceptable carrier.

15

20

25

30


35

1/45

FIGURE 1




2+



SUBSTITUTE SHEET

2/45


FIGURE 2



SUBSTITUTE SHEET

3/45


FIGURE 3



SUBSTITUTE SHEET

4/45

FIGURE 4



SUBSTITUTE SHEET

5/45

FIGURE 5A



FIGURE 5B



**SUBSTITUTE SHEET**

FIGURE 6A

6/45

FIGURE 6B











FIGURE 6C

FIGURE 6D



SUBSTITUTE SHEET

7/45

## LIGANDS

FIGURE 7A


1,10-phenanthroline  
(phen)

FIGURE 7B


2,2'-bipyridyl  
(bpy)

FIGURE 7C


9,10-phenanthrene  
quinonediimine  
(phi)

FIGURE 7D


4,7-diphenylphenanthroline  
(DIP)

FIGURE 7E







5-nitrophenanthroline  
(5-NO<sub>2</sub>-phen)

FIGURE 7F

4,5-diazafluorene-9-one  
(none)






8/45

FIGURE 8A<sub>1</sub>FIGURE 8A<sub>2</sub>FIGURE 8A<sub>3</sub>FIGURE 8A<sub>4</sub>

SUBSTITUTE SHEET


9/45

FIGURE 8A<sub>5</sub>FIGURE 8A<sub>6</sub>FIGURE 8A<sub>7</sub>

SUBSTITUTE SHEET

10/45


FIGURE 8B



SUBSTITUTE SHEET

11/45


FIGURE 9



SUBSTITUTE SHEET

12/45

FIGURE 10




SUBSTITUTE SHEET

13/45

FIGURE 11

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14



14/45

FIGURE 12A EXCITED STATE RESONANCE RAMAN SPECTRA





FIGURE 12B EXCITED STATE RESONANCE RAMAN SPECTRA




SUBSTITUTE SHEET

15/45

FIGURE 13A


**A B C D E F G H I J K**



**SUBSTITUTE SHEET**




16/45

FIGURE 13 B<sub>1</sub>

SUBSTITUTE SHEET

17/45


FIGURE 13B2



SUBSTITUTE SHEET

18/45


FIGURE 13C



SUBSTITUTE SHEET


19/45

FIGURE 14 A



SUBSTITUTE SHEET


20/45

FIGURE 14.  $\beta_1$ 

SUBSTITUTE SHEET

21/45


FIGURE 14B2



SUBSTITUTE SHEET

22/45

FIGURE 14C




SUBSTITUTE SHEET

23/45

FIGURE 15

ABCDEFGHI



SUBSTITUTE SHEET



24/45

FIGURE 16

ABCDEFGHIJ KLMNOPQRSTU




SUBSTITUTE SHEET

25/45

FIGURE 17

ABC DEFGH I JKLMNOPQRSTU



SUBSTITUTE SHEET

26/45

FIGURE 18A

35. 40 45 50 55

  
5' CCCCATATGCAAAAAGCATATGGG  
3' GGGGTATACGTTTTTTCGTATACCC  


FIGURE 18B


50 55 60 65 70 75 80

  
5' ATATGGGTACCGAGCTCGAATTCGTAATCATG  
3' TATACCCATGGCTCGAGCTTAAGCATTAGTAC  


SUBSTITUTE SHEET

27/45

FIGURE 19A

(a)  $\text{Rh}(\text{phi})_2(\text{bpy})_3^{3+}$ 

SUBSTITUTE SHEET

28/45

FIGURE 19B

(b) MPE-Fe(II)



SUBSTITUTE SHEET

29/45


FIGURE 19C

c) DNase I  
A B C D E F




FIGURE 19D

d)  $\text{Cu}(\text{phen})_2^+$   
A B C D E F




30/45

FIGURE 20



31/45

FIGURE 21A




SUBSTITUTE SHEET



32/45

FIGURE 21B




SUBSTITUTE SHEET

33/45

FIGURE 21C


$\text{Ru}(\text{bpy})_2(\text{dppz})^{2+}$  (10 $\mu\text{M}$ ) +  
poly d(GC) .d(GC) (100 $\mu\text{M}$ )  
Z-form/Buffer "R-L"



SUBSTITUTE SHEET

34/45


FIGURE 22



SUBSTITUTE SHEET

35/45


FIGURE 23



SUBSTITUTE SHEET

36/45


FIGURE 24



SUBSTITUTE SHEET

37/45


FIGURE 25



SUBSTITUTE SHEET

38/45


FIGURE 26



SUBSTITUTE SHEET

39/45

FIGURE 27




SUBSTITUTE SHEET



40/45


FIGURE 28



SUBSTITUTE SHEET

41/45


FIGURE 29



SUBSTITUTE SHEET

42/45


FIGURE 30



SUBSTITUTE SHEET

43/45


FIGURE 31



SUBSTITUTE SHEET

44/45


FIGURE 32



SUBSTITUTE SHEET

45/45

FIGURE 33



SUBSTITUTE SHEET

# INTERNATIONAL SEARCH REPORT

International Application No. PCT/US89/04989

## I. CLASSIFICATION OF SUBJECT MATTER (If several classification symbols apply, indicate all) \*

According to International Patent Classification (IPC) or to both National Classification and IPC 15/06.

IPC(5th): C 07 F/subs 1/08, 3/06, 3/08, 7/24, 13/00, 15/00, 15/02, &

US Cl.: 546/10; 544/225; 556/subs. 33, 56, 81, 110, 118, 136-138

## II. FIELDS SEARCHED

### Minimum Documentation Searched ?

Classification System	Classification Symbols
US Cl.:	546/10; 544/225; 556/subs. 33, 56, 81, 110, 118, and 136-138.

Documentation Searched other than Minimum Documentation to the Extent that such Documents are Included in the Fields Searched \*

## III. DOCUMENTS CONSIDERED TO BE RELEVANT \*

Category *	Citation of Document, ** with indication, where appropriate, of the relevant passages **	Relevant to Claim No. **
X	N, "Aifa Catalog, Research Chemicals and Materials". Issued 1983, Morton Thiokol, Inc.(Danvers, MA, U.S.A.), see p. 585.	1-3, 6, 26, 27
A	US, A 4,292,435 ITATANI ET AL., Published 29 September 1981, see columns 1-16.	1-3, 6, 26, 27
X	US, A 4,772,563 EVANGELISTA ET AL., Published 20 September 1988, see columns 1-36.	1-3, 6, 26, 27
X	US, A 2,578,910 URANEK, Published 18 Decmeber 1951, see columns 1-10.	1-3, 6, 26, 27

### \* Special categories of cited documents: \*\*

- "A" document defining the general state of the art which is not considered to be of particular relevance
- "E" earlier document but published on or after the international filing date
- "L" document which may throw doubts on priority claim(s) or which is cited to establish the publication date of another citation or other special reason (as specified)
- "O" document referring to an oral disclosure, use, exhibition or other means
- "P" document published prior to the international filing date but later than the priority date claimed

"T" later document published after the international filing date or priority date and not in conflict with the application but cited to understand the principle or theory underlying the invention

"X" document of particular relevance; the claimed invention cannot be considered novel or cannot be considered to involve an inventive step

"Y" document of particular relevance; the claimed invention cannot be considered to involve an inventive step when the document is combined with one or more other such documents, such combination being obvious to a person skilled in the art.

"A" document member of the same patent family

## IV. CERTIFICATION

Date of the Actual Completion of the International Search

02 April 1990

Date of Mailing of this International Search Report

20 APR 1990

International Searching Authority

ISA/US

Signature of Authorized Officer

L. E. Crane

## FURTHER INFORMATION CONTINUED FROM THE SECOND SHEET

X	GB, B 956,241 AUSTRALIAN NATIONAL UNIVERSITY, Published 22 April 1964, see pp. 1-14.	1-3, 6, 26, 27
X	N, "Synthesis in Inorganic and Metal-organic Chemistry," Volume 3(2), Issued 1973, M Dekker, Inc.(New York, New York), D. M. Soignet et al., "Critical Factors in the Synthesis of Tris Complexes of Chromium (III) with 2,2'-bipyridine and 1,10-phenanthroline," see pp. 167-174.	1-3, 6, 26, 27

V. ☐ OBSERVATIONS WHERE CERTAIN CLAIMS WERE FOUND UNSEARCHABLE<sup>1</sup>

This international search report has not been established in respect of certain claims under Article 17(2) (a) for the following reasons:

1. ☐ Claim numbers \_\_\_\_\_, because they relate to subject matter<sup>12</sup> not required to be searched by this Authority, namely:
  
2. ☐ Claim numbers \_\_\_\_\_, because they relate to parts of the international application that do not comply with the prescribed requirements to such an extent that no meaningful international search can be carried out<sup>13</sup>, specifically:
  
3. ☐ Claim numbers \_\_\_\_\_, because they are dependent claims not drafted in accordance with the second and third sentences of PCT Rule 6.4(a).

VI. ☒ OBSERVATIONS WHERE UNITY OF INVENTION IS LACKING<sup>2</sup>

This International Searching Authority found multiple inventions in this international application as follows:

1. ☐ As all required additional search fees were timely paid by the applicant, this international search report covers all searchable claims of the international application.
2. ☐ As only some of the required additional search fees were timely paid by the applicant, this international search report covers only those claims of the international application for which fees were paid, specifically claims:
3. ☒ No required additional search fees were timely paid by the applicant. Consequently, this international search report is restricted to the invention first mentioned in the claims; it is covered by claim numbers:
4. ☐ As all searchable claims could be searched without effort justifying an additional fee, the International Searching Authority did not invite payment of any additional fee.

Remark on Protest

- ☐ The additional search fees were accompanied by applicant's protest.
- ☐ No protest accompanied the payment of additional search fees.